

A N
A N S W E R
T O

Mr. *Edward Hitchin's*
B O O K,

INTITULED,
*The Infants Cause pleaded,
clear'd and vindicated, &c.*

By the late Reverend
Mr. *SAMUEL EWER*
of HEMPSTEAD.

I THESS. V. 21. *Prove all things; hold fast that
which is good.*

L O N D O N:

Printed for *W. Marshal* in *Gracechurch-street*, *J. Baker*
at *Mercers-chappel* in *Cheapside*, and *J. Marshal* in
Newgate-street, 1710. Price bound 1 s. 6 d.

714
12



gra
ful
to
bea
of
opp
Mo
rita
The
well
ve

TO THE
READER.

THE Copy of the ensuing Treatise being put into our Hands after the Author's Death, we perused it, and upon due Examination concluded it would be great Injustice to deprive the Public of so useful a Book. For, tho' none of us are desirous to promote Controversy, yet, from the Love we bear to Truth, we can't but commend the Zeal of those who appear in the Defence of it when'tis opposed, especially if they do it with Calmness and Moderation, not returning virulent and uncharitable Reflections instead of solid Arguments. This the Author of the following Sheets has very well observ'd thro' his whole Discourse, which, we doubt not, will greatly recommend it to all

candid and impartial Readers. He treats not his warm Antagonist with any thing that is either irritating or trifling; his modest and humble Spirit no more suffering him to do the one, than his Gravity and solid Judgment would permit him to descend to the other. We can't but think the Author's Distinction well founded between the Covenant of Circumcision made with Abraham and his natural Seed, and that of eternal Blessings established with him and his spiritual Seed in Christ; and that he hath very judiciously shewn, that no Argument in favour of Infant-baptism, can be deduced from the Covenant of Circumcision, Baptism being altogether a Matter of positive Worship, depending on the sole Pleasure of the Lawgiver, both as to the Subject and Mode of Administration. In a word therefore, we judge this Treatise to be in all respects a sufficient Confutation of Mr. Hitchin's Book.

The many weighty Affairs lying on the Author's Hands while writing this Book, together with the suddenness of his Death, which followed so closely upon his finishing the first Draught of it, were the chief Reasons that it came forth no sooner. Had it pass'd the last Touches of his own Hand, 'twould doubtless have appear'd in a much more polite and correct Dress, than now it does. But, tho' it want those further Advantages it would have received, had he liv'd to review it, and publish it himself; yet we hope no one will have cause

To the R E A D E R. V

cause to repent his Labour, who shall give it a serious and impartial Perusal. If the Author's Notion of the Covenant of Redemption, and the Covenant of Grace, being but one and the same Covenant, consisting of divers Parts and Branches, be different from that of some other Divines; yet he delivers his Opinion with such Modesty, that we think it can give no just Offence to any of a different Mind. For our parts, we desire nothing advanc'd in this Book may pass for Truth, any further than 'tis supported by the Holy Scriptures, for to them alone we appeal for our Doctrine, Discipline and Worship; and therefore earnestly intreat all Persons, into whose Hands it may come, daily to search the Scriptures, like the noble Bereans, to see whether these things are so, or not.

We shall not here detain the Reader with a large Account of the Author, and therefore it shall suffice to say, that he was a very laborious and successful Preacher, one who studied to shew himself approved unto God, a Workman that needeth not be ashamed, rightly dividing the Word of Truth; upon the account of which, and other Accomplishments, which we now omit, his Name and Memory will be deservedly precious in the Churches of Christ, not only in this, but future Ages.

To conclude, we heartily recommend the following Treatise to the serious Perusal of all ingenious

vi . To the R E A D E R.

mons and unprejudic'd Inquirers after Truth, believing it capable to speak for it self, and therefore shall add no more but our earnest Prayers to God, that it may be followed with a Divine Blessing.

Tho. Marfom.
James Harding.
John Ward.
Mathew Dutton.

Richard Carter.
Anthony Burges.
Thomas Aldridge.

R E.

REMARKS on the Commendatory Epistle prefix'd to Mr. H's Book.

BEfore I proceed to the Consideration of the *Treatise* to which this is designed as an *Answer*, it may not be improper to take notice of a few things in the *Epistle* prefix'd to it, wherein some Account is given both of the *Author*, and that *Work* of his.

The first part of the Character, which those Reverend Persons give of the *Author*, is, that he is a *plain, humble, and serious Christian*, &c. As for his *Humility*, I can't but wish he had given better proof of it, in being both less positive in what he asserts, and more sparing in his Censures and injurious Reflections upon those he opposes. And therefore it may not be amiss to put him in mind of the Words of the Apostle, 2 Cor. x. 18. *Not he that commendeth himself, nor he whom others commend, but he whom the Lord commendeth, is approved.*

Another part of his Character is, that he hath a *clear Head*. It seems then, when we find the Stream of his Discourse to run muddy, we must attribute it rather to the Cause he pleads, than to any Defects of its *Advocate*.

It is further testify'd of him, that he *hath been led into a more than common Acquaintance with the Subject of Infant-baptism, by the frequent Conversation he hath had with many upon that Point*. By reading his *Treatise* it may indeed be easily discern'd, that either he gain'd what Knowledge he hath of the Objections of those who deny Infant-baptism, by conversing with Men, and those too not the most expert in the Controversy, rather than from what has been writ on that Subject; or else, that he hath purposely wav'd the most weighty Objections in their full Strength, lest he should be discern'd by his Readers to have started such Difficulties which he was not able to solve.

As to the *Treatise*, we are told that it contains *some Hints that are not usually to be met with in other Authors*. But unless they are of greater Strength too, than those of other Authors, they are no more likely to convince Persons of a different Judgment, than theirs. And that they are not, I hope to prove, when I come to the Consideration of them.

'Tis added, that we shall also meet with a *large and laborious Collection of such Texts of Scripture, as do not only serve to give light to each other, but all together greatly help to clear the main Point*

viii *Remarks on the Commendatory Epistle, &c.*

Point in hand. I readily grant that the Number of *Scriptures* cited by him is very *large*, but what *Labour* he imploy'd in collecting them I know not, and can't but think, if those who thus recommend this *Work*, had allowed themselves so much time from their weightier *Studies*, as to examine particularly the *Texts* produc'd by him, they must have seen that the far greater part of them speak nothing to the purpose for which they are brought. I have my self carefully perus'd them all, but judge I should too much press upon the Reader's *Patience*, to insist particularly upon any more than those from which he undertakes to argue, which are doubtless in his *Opinion* the most weighty; altho something, as *Occasion* offers, may likewise be said of the rest. But there is somewhat yet behind, that deserves our *Notice*.

His *Arguments* are affirm'd to be *strong and solid*. Whence I may suppose, that if these *Gentlemen* had undertaken to plead this *Cause*, they would probably have made use of the same, or such like *Arguments*. What *Advantages* then soever the *Author's Circumstances* have denied him, it seems Men possess'd of those *Advantages* highly approve of his *Performance*. But how he hath acquitted himself in this respect, it is my *Business* to examine in the subsequent *Discourse*.

But what follows I most wonder at, where they tell us, that he does generally avoid those *hard Words* and *bitter Reflections*, that are too common with others on these *Occasions*. The *Restriction* used in these *Words* was certainly very convenient, as it don't clear every part of his *Discourse* from the dark *Character*, which it seems the *Writings* of others on this *Subject* too commonly merit, since 'tis only asserted that he generally avoids those things. And I am perswaded, had an *Antipedobaptist* insinuated, as he does of us, that they give the flat *Lie* to many *Texts* of *Scripture*, as p. 14. that altho' they had been bray'd in the *Mortar* of *Scripture Evidence*, yet their *Folly* had not departed from them, p. 45. that they, thro' *Pride* of their own *Abilities*, condemn and despise others, p. 51. reject *Christ*, p. 48. despise and persecute the *Members* of *Christ*, p. 71. or, had compar'd them to *hard-hearted Pharaoh*, and intimated that they gratify, and do a great *Pleasure* to the *Devil*, p. 87. I say, had these *Expressions*, and many more of the like nature, that are to be found in him, come from an *Antipedobaptist*, they would have been thought very *hard Words* and *bitter Reflections*. But I hope my *Prayer* to the *Lord* for him shall be, that *Repentance* may be given him for these harsh and causeless *Speeches*; and for my self, that my own *Mind* may not be so discomposed by them, as to render *Evil* for *Evil*.

The CONTENTS.

REMARKS on the Commendatory Epistle prefix'd to Mr. H's Book. p. vii

INTRODUCTION, shewing in vi Propositions that Believers Children, as such, have no Right to Baptism from the Covenant, 1. **PROP. I.** The Covenant of Grace is established with Christ, as that of Works was with Adam, ib. The Covenant of Redemption and that of Grace seem not two distinct Covenants, 2. **PROP. II.** The effectual Communication of saving Grace is promised to all the Seed in Covenant, 3. **PROP. III.** The final Perseverance of all in Covenant is secured by the Promises, 6. The Distinction of an inward and outward Covenant rejected by Mr. Baxter, 8. **PROP. IV.** The Covenant of Grace differs in Substance and Kind from the Sinai Covenant, 9. **PROP. V.** Covenant-interest is no Warrant for the Administration of a positive Institution, without an express Command, 16. **PROP. VI.** The Holy Spirit is the only Seal of the Covenant of Grace, 17. The Argument drawn from Rom. iv. 11. to prove Circumcision a Seal of the Covenant of Grace, considered, 19. from Col. ii. 11, 12. p. 21. from Gen. xvii. 7. p. 23. The Covenant mentioned Gen. xvii. of the like nature with the Sinai Covenant, 25. Two Covenants established with Abraham, as Father of a twofold Seed, 27.

HAP. I. Remarks on Mr. H's Introduction. 31.

HAP. II. An Answer to Mr. H's i Chapter, wherein he asserts that Children were always included in the same Covenant with their Parents, and Church-members, 40. His Instances in proof of the former considered, 40. Several contrary Instances produc'd, 48. His Proofs for Infants Church-membership considered, 50. Infants in the Jewish Church seem to have partaken of the Passover, 54. As antient Testimonies for Infants being admitted to the Lord's Supper, as to Baptism, 55. His Reason for their being capable of the latter, and not the former, considered, ib. The Author's Judgment concerning those who die in Infancy, 58. Mr. H's Argument from the Names antiently given to Children by godly Parents considered, 59. The Reason for passing by his second Chapter, 61.

HAP. III. An Answer to Mr. H's iii Chapter, in which he attempts to prove that Believers Children are together with their Parents in the New Covenant, as administr'd since Christ's coming, 61. The Scriptures alledg'd by him considered, 62. The Terms Old and New Covenant explained, 65. His ten Arguments considered, by which he undertakes to prove that the Covenant made with Abraham both in Gen. xii. 3. & xvii. 7. is the New Covenant, 66.

CHAP.

The Contents.

- CHAP. IV.** An Answer to Mr. H's iv Chapter, proving, against his Exceptions, that in *Gal. iii. 16.* *Christ personal is primarily intended*, 74. *Ephes. ii. 3.* considered, 76. The Opinion of the Council of *Neocæsaria*, that a Profession of Faith is requisite to Baptism, 77. *Gal. ii. 15.* considered, 78.
- CHAP. V.** An Answer to Mr. H's v Chapter, the Design of which is to shew that *the Infants of believing Gentiles were in Covenant under the Old Testament*, 79. The difference between *Abraham's Practice in Circumcision*, and the *Apostles in Baptism*, 81. The Argument from the Baptism of *Houliholds* considered: that of the *Failer*, *Acts xvi. 33.* of *Lydia*, *Acts xvi. 14.* of *Stephanas*, *1 Cor. i. 16. p. 83.* *Luke xix. 9.* explained, 88. Difference between the Jewish and Christian Church-state, 89. What 'tis to be of *Abraham's Faith*, 92.
- CHAP. VI.** An Answer to Mr. H's vi Chapter, in which he undertakes to prove that *Christ when on Earth did not turn Infants out of the Visible Church*, 93. *Mark ix. 36. x. 14.* &c. *Mat. xx. 13.* &c. *Luke xviii. 15.* &c. explained from *Grotius*, 95.
- CHAP. VII.** An Answer to Mr. H's vii Chapter, wherein he indeavours to shew that *Infants were not turned out of the Church by the Apostles*, 101. His Arguments drawn from several Passages in the *Acts*, particularly *Chap. ii. 39.* considered, 103. *Christ in Infancy*, and before his Incarnation, Head of the invisible Church, 114. The Argument taken from *Rom. xi.* considered, *ib.* His Assertion from *Esth. viii. 17.* that *Proselytes* were sometimes called *Jews*, considered, 125. The Instance of *Fether*, *ib.* Mr. *Pool's* Opinion of that Instance, *ib.* The Argument from *Ephes. ii.* consider'd, 131. from *1 Cor. vii. 14.* with *Hunnius's* Explication of it, 134. Some further Arguments to prove that the Faith of Parents don't make their Children Church-members, 136. nor the *Pedobaptists* treat them as such, 137.
- CHAP. VIII.** An Answer to Mr. H's viii Chapter, wherein the Proof of *Childrens Church-membership* is attempted by him from several Types and Figures in the Old Testament, 139.
- CHAP. IX.** An Answer to Mr. H's ix Chapter, in which he pretends to prove that *a Profession of Faith is not required of all to Baptism*, 142. His Misrepresentation of the Principles both of the General and Particular Baptists, 145. His xxii Heads from Scripture for baptizing Infants considered, 148. *St. Austin's* Testimony that Infants can't believe, 157.
- CHAP. X.** An Answer to Mr. H's x Chapter, containing the Testimonies of Protestant Churches for Infant-baptism, 164. Infant-baptism not introduc'd, so far as appears, till the 3d Century, *ib.* The *Waldenses* denied Baptism to Infants, 167. Mr. *Philpot's* Mistake as to the Rise of Antipedobaptism, *ib.*
- CONCLUSION,

*An. Answer to Mr. E. Hitchin's
Book, Intituled, The Infants
Cause pleaded, clear'd and
vindicated, &c.*

The INTRODUCTION.

IN order to give the Reader a true State of the Con-
troversy between us, and our Pedobaptist Brethren,
as to their Argument from the Covenant, whereon
they lay the greatest stress, I shall here present him
at one view with the Reasons which make me
think no cogent Argument can be thence deduced, to
evince the Right of Believers Children, as such, to Bap-
tism, without interrupting the Series of the Discourse,
with what is advanced by my Antagonist in defence of
their Practice. To this end therefore I shall premise and
confirm the following Propositions.

PROP. I: The Covenant of Grace is established
with Christ the second *Adam*, as the Head and Repre-
sentative of all the Seed given him of the Father; as the
Covenant of Works was with the first *Adam*, as a Cove-
nant-head to all his Seed.

That there was a Covenant transacted between the Fa-
ther and Son before the Foundation of the World,
wherein the Father promised to give the Son a Seed, that
should be made Partakers of Grace and Glory by him;
and that he would assist him in, and carry him thro'
the Work proposed to him, and crown him as Mediator,
with the highest Glory and Honour, on condition of
his assuming our Nature, and therein yielding perfect
Obedience to the holy and righteous Law of God, and
undergoing the Curse threatned in the Sanction of it,
on the behalf, and in the stead of those for whom he un-
dertook,

dertook, which he voluntarily ingaged to do; is generally own'd by those with whom I am concern'd in this Controversy, and therefore there is no occasion for me to insist on the proof of it. But our Pedobaptist Brethren, and some Antipedobaptists also, are not fully agreed, whether this federal Transaction between the Father and Son, (which some call the Covenant of Suretyship and Redemption) be a Covenant distinct from the Covenant of Grace, into which the spiritual Seed are admitted in time. And as the Cause, in which I am ingaged, doth not require it; so I am conscious to my self of my inability to give any determination in this matter. I shall content my self therefore with endeavouring to shew, that the Argument most relied on; to prove them two distinct Covenants, doth not seem, in my apprehension; to be satisfactory, *viz.* That there are some Conditions prescrib'd, and Promises made to Christ; wherein his Seed are no otherwise concern'd, but as they stand in relation to him; and some Duties enjoined, and Promises made to his Seed, wherein they are immediately and distinctly concern'd. It is well known, that in Leagues between Princes, some Articles immediately concern the Prerogatives of the Princes themselves, and their Subjects only as they stand in relation to them; and others have a peculiar respect to their Subjects, as distinguish'd from them; and yet these Articles are all contain'd in one and the same League and Covenant. 'Tis true also, that the Covenant was transacted between the Father and Son in Eternity, and the Seed given to the Son by the Father have no actual Interest in the Privileges and Blessings of it till they believe, yet I cannot thence discern any just ground to denominate them two distinct Covenants. For in any Contract or Grant, extending to future Generations, those unborn at the time of making it, cannot actually enjoy a share in the Privileges thereof, before they have really a Being, which yet they do in the appointed Season; by the same Covenant or Grant, that their Fathers did some Ages before. But be this as it will, our Brethren, even those who esteem them two distinct Covenants, do generally own, that the eternal Gift of a People to Christ, and his acceptance of them, is the Spring and Foundation of the Covenant of Grace. And as these answer each other, as Cause and Effect, Fountain and Stream;

Decree

Decree and Execution; they must surely be of equal Extent, and no more receiv'd into the latter, than were contain'd in the former. And that the Offspring of Believers, as such, were so given by the Father, and accepted by the Son; and the Offspring of Unbelievers, as such, left out of it; no modest Observer will assert. If they say, the Event proves that ordinarily more of the Children of Believers, than of Unbelievers, were contain'd in that Eternal Grant, I shall readily own it; but we know not which were, and which were not, until it be discover'd by their believing. And if Covenant-interest was the proper ground (as our Brethren suppose) of the Administration of Baptism, we must wait for some Discovery of it, and can have no ground to proceed till that be made. I know some have urged to us, as that which they pretended we could never avoid the force of; that many of those which we baptize, appear afterwards to be such that never were in Covenant, and that being therein deceived, we cannot defend our own Practice, if we except against theirs on this account. But there is a vast disparity in the case, which they would persuade us is the same. For they baptize on account of the supposed Promises of God, (who cannot be deceived, or deceive us) to take the Offspring of his People, as such, into Covenant with himself; but we, as the Scripture directs, on account of the profession of Faith, that is made by them that offer themselves to Baptism. And if due care be taken by the Administrators to baptize none but such, whom according to a Judgment of Charity, they look upon to have believ'd *with all the Heart*; should it afterwards appear that they never were real Partakers of the Faith whereof we speak, those concern'd in their Admission may rest satisfy'd in having proceeded according to the Rule. But our Brethren's Plea to baptize Infants (or at least to do that which they so call and account) upon the pretended ground of the absolute Promise of the unchangeable, and faithful God, to take all the Infantseed of his People into the Covenant of Grace, is quite of another Nature; for, either God hath not promis'd it, and then their Plea is groundless; or else his Promise is not fulfill'd to such of the Offspring of his People as perish eternally. And I know our Brethren dare not entertain such a Thought, that God himself can fail of his Word; although Men, whose credible profession of Faith by the di-

rection of Holy Writ is our Rule, may deceive us. I shall sum up what I intend by this Proposition, in the following Argument.

All that are interested in the Covenant of Grace in time, were given to the Son in the eternal federal Transactions between the Father and him.

The Offspring of Believers, as such, were not given to the Son in the eternal federal Transactions between the Father and him.

E. The Offspring of Believers, as such, are not interested in the Covenant of Grace.

Did the Sin of the first *Adam*, by virtue of the Covenant established with him for his Seed, bring them all under Condemnation, as *Rom. v. 18.* and shall not the Righteousness of the second *Adam*, by virtue of the Covenant made with him for his Seed, as effectually bring his in the appointed Season into an Estate of Justification unto Life Eternal? For so saith the Spirit of God by the Apostle, *Therefore as by the Offence of one, Judgment came upon all Men to Condemnation; even so by the Righteousness of one, the free Gift came upon all Men unto Justification of Life. For as by one Man's Disobedience many were made Sinners; so by the Obedience of one shall many be made Righteous.* And that Justification and Sanctification are inseparable, always meeting in the same Subjects, our Brethren will not deny. For altho' Sanctification is no part of that Righteousness whereby a Sinner is justify'd before God; yet the Wisdom and Holiness of God require that every justify'd Person be also sanctify'd. If then it appear, as most certainly it doth, that the Children of Believers, as such, are not justify'd and sanctify'd; it must (so far as I can discern) inevitably follow, that they are not, as such, the Seed of the second *Adam*; and consequently have no Interest in the Covenant of Grace establish'd with him for them.

PROP. II. The faithful God, in the Covenant of Grace, hath expressly promised the effectual Communication of saving Graces to all the Seed in Covenant.

For the Confirmation of this Proposition, I need only recite the Promises of the New Covenant, as recorded *Jer. xxxi. 33, 34.* *But this shall be the Covenant that I will*

make

The Introduction.

5

make with the House of Israel, After those Days, saith the Lord, I will put my Law in their inward Parts, and write it in their Hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my People. And they shall teach no more every Man his Neighbour, and every Man his Brother, saying, Know ye the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord; for I will forgive their Iniquity, and I will remember their Sin no more. And Chap. xxxii. 38, 39, 40. And they shall be my People, and I will be their God. And I will give them one Heart, and one Way; that they may fear me for ever, for the good of them, and of their Children after them. And I will make an everlasting Covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them, to do them good; but I will put my Fear in their Hearts. Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26, 27. Then will I sprinkle clean Water upon you, and ye shall be clean from all your Filthiness, and from all your Idols will I cleanse you. A new Heart also will I give you, and a new Spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the stony Heart out of your Flesh, and I will give you an Heart of Flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my Statutes, and ye shall keep my Judgments, and do them. These, with other Scriptures, which, for brevity's sake, I omit, are so plain, and expresse, in proof of the Proposition, that I cannot suppose our Brethren can deny the Truth of it. And can these Promises, which respect the Implantation of the habits of Grace, depend on the performance of any Condition on our parts? Our Brethren, at other times, tell us the contrary, as I can fully make appear from their Writings, if need require. For, although grown Persons are obliged, where opportunity is afforded, to attend on the use of such means, whereby God ordinarily worketh Grace, and earnestly to intreat a Blessing thereon; yet their so doing cannot properly be called the Condition of his gracious Communication thereof to them. But on what Condition may it be supposed the fulfilling thereof to Infants can depend? And that the Graces promised to all in the Covenant, from the least to the greatest of them, are not communicated to the Seed of Believers, as such, is too evident to leave room for any to doubt thereof. Christ hath paid the price of his Blood to purchase Grace here, as well as Glory hereafter, for all his Seed; and the Father hath assured him, that he shall

have what he purchased; and it is his Pleasure that all fullness thereof should be repositied in him, to be given out to those, for whom he especially undertook, as 'tis evident from *Isa. liii. 11. Acts v. 31. Phil. i. 29. Col. i. 19. John i. 16, 17.* And I cannot entertain such a Thought, that they who love Christ, can doubt of his Willingness and Faithfulness to make them Partakers of that which he hath purchased at the expence of his Blood, and is actually invested, as Mediator, with a right to bestow, and hath promised that he will do it to every one in Covenant. I shall briefly sum up what I hence design in this Argument.

All who are interested in the New Covenant, have the effectual Communication of the Graces of the Holy Spirit purchased for, and promised to them.

The Seed of Believers, as such, have not the effectual Communication of the Graces of the Holy Spirit.

E. The Seed of Believers, as such, are not interested in the New Covenant.

PROP. III. The final Perseverance of those who are interested in the New Covenant, is fully secur'd by the Promises of that Covenant.

This is fully confirm'd by the following Scriptures, *Jer. xxxi. 34.* To all these, *from the least to the greatest,* the Lord saith, *I will forgive their Iniquity, and I will remember their Sin no more.* And *Chap. xxxii. 40.* *I will make an everlasting Covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them, to do them good, but I will put my Fear in their Hearts, that they shall not depart from me.* *Isa. lix. 21.* *As for me, this is my Covenant with them, saith the Lord, my Spirit which is upon thee, (here, by the way, it may be observ'd, that the Promises of the New Covenant are made to Christ, as a Covenant-head unto his Seed, and to his People in him) and my Words which I have put in thy Mouth, shall not depart out of thy Mouth, nor out of the Mouth of thy Seed, nor out of the Mouth of thy Seed's Seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth, and for ever.* *Chap. liv. 10.* *For the Mountains shall depart, and the Hills be removed, but my Kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the Covenant of my Peace be removed, saith the Lord, that hath Mercy on thee.* To which I could add many more expresse Testimonies of ho-

ly Writ ; but the Doctrine of final Perseverance being generally own'd and asserted by those with whom I am principally concern'd in this Controversy, (how disagreeing to it soever this Practice of theirs be) it is needless for me to cite more, or spend time in shewing how fully the Truth of the Proposition is proved by them ; they being some of the same which themselves, at other times, allege in Confirmation of this Truth. But I cannot conceive how the Plea insisted on by them for Pedobaptism, from the Covenant-interest of Believers Seed, as such, can possibly consist herewith. For certainly Believers Infants, as such, are not in this Covenant ; or, some interested therein do finally fall away. Neither can I find that the usual Distinction which some make, will yield them any relief in this Case, who tell us, that by such Children being in Covenant, they mean the external part of it : For, if the Scripture make no such Distinction between the *internal* and *external* part of the Covenant of Grace, 'tis unwarrantable and groundless so to do ; and I could never see they were able to prove it from the Holy Scripture. It hath been held as an allow'd Maxim, *Ubi lex non distinguit, non est distinguendum.* i. e. *We ought not to distinguish, where the Law doth not distinguish.* And if we allow our selves in making unwritten Distinctions to serve a turn, what Truth may not suffer, and Error be promoted by it ? And if this external part of the Covenant be only a right to external Ordinances, where is the Charity of their Opinion beyond that of ours ? Doth this outward Covenant give a right to all Believers Children to eternal Salvation, (tho' the outside of *Noah's Ark* would have preserv'd none from drowning) and this without conveying Grace into them ? For otherwise they would be in the inward Covenant, as sometimes they express it. But how any one can have an immediate right to Salvation, and with it receive not Regeneration, to give him a meetness for it, I may wait long enough before I am satisfy'd, from any Proof that can be brought from the Word of God. Or, do those who use this Distinction conclude, that in this respect, they are in the same Condition with Unbelievers Children, (whom they seem too harshly to esteem all destitute of any Title to Glory) having no right to Heaven, but only to Ordinances ; and yet allow them no Ordinance, which they look upon Covenant-interest to give a right to, but Baptism

only? But to pass this, I must say, it seems very strange that the Son, who was so faithful in his House, should leave us to spell out a Right to a positive Institution from such dark and unintelligible Notions; when *Moses*, the Servant, gave such plain Directions as to the Subjects, and time of Administration of legal Ordinances. And to conclude, I shall subjoin what Mr. *Baxter*, a zealous Defender of Infant Baptism, saith of this Distinction of an *outward* and *inward* Covenant, in his *Answer* to Mr. *Blake*, Sect. 39. where he tells us, "Mr. *Blake's* common Phrase is, that "they are in the outward Covenant, and what that is, I cannot tell; I know what it is to Covenant, *Ore tenus*, "only *outwardly*, or by a dissembled Profession, or else a "Profession maimed or not understood; and I have said, "that hereby they may further oblige themselves, so far "as the Creature can be said to oblige it self, who is not "*sui juris*, [*his own*] but wholly God's, and is under his "absolute Obligation already. But it is God's Covenant- "act that we are enquiring after; in what sense is that "called outward? It cannot be as if God did, as the dis- "sembling Creature, *Ore tenus*, with the *Mouth* only co- "venant with them, and not with the Heart, as they "deal with him. I know therefore no possible Sense "but this, that it is call'd outward from the Blessings "promised, which are outward; here therefore I should "have thought it reasonable for Mr. *Blake* to have told "us what those outward Blessings are, that this Covenant "promiseth; and that he would have prov'd out of the "Scripture that God hath such a Covenant distinct from "the Covenant of Grace." And after having deny'd Bap- "tism, or the Lord's Supper, the Word or Discipline, to be "such a Covenant, he adds; "I desire therefore those words "of Scripture may be produc'd where any such Covenant "is contain'd, &c." What I design by this Proposition, is briefly compriz'd in the Argument following.

All who are interest'd in the New Covenant, have their final Perseverance firmly secur'd to them by the Promises of that Covenant.

The Offspring of Believers, as such, have not their final Perseverance firmly secur'd to them.

E. The Offspring of Believers, as such, are not interest'd in the New Covenant.

PROP.

PROP. IV. The Covenant of Grace differeth in Substance and Kind, and not in the manner of Administration only from the Covenant at Sinai.

The Truth of this Proposition is so fully demonstrated by that learned and eminent Divine, Dr. Owen, in his *Exposition upon the Epistle to the Hebrews*, especially on Verse 6. of the viii. Chapter, that 'twould be needless for me to say any more in Confirmation of it, if all, into whose hands this may come, had the opportunity of inspecting that. And I hope this may tend to remove that Reproach, which some formerly have cast on us for so asserting, viz. "That we therein symbolize with the Papists." For they will not suppose this learned Person's Interest oblig'd him to it, whatever hath been suggested of us, who are as far from espousing any Opinion because held by the Papists, as our Pedobaptist Brethren; altho neither we nor they dare reject a plain Truth, because held by them. But I shall here offer a few words to demonstrate the truth of it. The nature of these Covenants is best understood by the Terms that Life is promis'd upon, in the one, and in the other; if these be specifically different, then so are the Covenants wherein they are contained. If the one promise Life only on perfect doing, the other in a way of free Grace thro' believing, it cannot be deny'd but that they are two distinct Covenants, substantially different. And that so it is, will, I think, be evident to those who impartially consider the Account that the Holy Scripture gives us of them. In *Rom. x. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.* the Spirit of God by the Apostle compares them, and shews the difference to be such as I have intimated. For Moses describeth the Righteousness which is of the Law, that the Man that doth those things shall live by them. But the Righteousness which is of Faith speaketh on this wise, Say not in thine Heart, who shall ascend into Heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down from above) Or, who shall descend into the Deep? (that is, to bring up Christ again from the Dead) But what saith it? The Word is nigh thee, even in thy Mouth, and in thy Heart: That is, the word of Faith, which we preach, That if thou shalt confess with thy Mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine Heart, that God hath raised him from the Dead, thou shalt be saved. What the Apostle here citeth from Moses, is recorded, *Lev. xviii. 5.* and repeated

peated Ezek. xx. 11. To the like purpose also the same Apostle speaketh in his Epistle to the Galatians, chap. iii. 11, 12. *But that no Man is justified by the Law in the Sight of God, it is evident; for the Just shall live by Faith. And the Law is not of Faith; but the Man that doth them shall live in them.* And as the Law promised Life only upon perfect Obedience, so it denounced a direful Curse against every one that fell short of that Obedience, as Deut. xxvii. 26. *Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this Law, to do them.* And for this end, the Apostle, Gal. iii. 10. reciteth those words of Moses's Law, that he might convince those that were declining from the Faith of the Gospel to look for Righteousness, at least in part, by their Obedience to the Law, (to which all are naturally prone,) of the Impossibility of ever attaining to it that way; *For as many as are of the Works of the Law are under the Curse: For it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the Book of the Law to do them.* Now, if the Covenant made with Israel at Mount Sinai be intended by the Law, in these Words of the Apostle, as the Places whence he citeth them, seem to make it plain that it is, these two Covenants can no more be one and the same, than Faith, and Works may be said to be all one in the Point of Justification, which the Apostle so frequently opposeth to each other in that respect. And further, that the Covenant at Sinai is intended by the Law, is evident from hence, that as the whole System of Precepts, Moral, Ceremonial, and Judicial, delivered to the Jews on the Terms before mentioned, are intended by the Apostle, when he shews the Excellency of the Gospel, above the Law; so the Precepts concerning all sorts of Sacrifices, Heb. x. 8. are declared to be a Part of it. And if any could lay a fairer Claim than others, of the whole Body of their Laws, to appertain to the Gospel-covenant, or free Promise made unto Abraham, these, as most eminently Typical of the Atonement to be made by Christ, our great High Priest, might do so. In Gal. iii. 17. by the Law, the Mount Sinai Covenant is plainly intended, where the Apostle, to obviate an Objection that might be made against what he had before said, That the Law pronounceth every Transgressor accursed; as tho' it took away all solid hope of Salvation from those under the Legal Covenant; lays down this Assertion, *That the Covenant which was be-*
fore

fore confirmed of God in Christ, the Law, which was 430 Years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the Promise of none Effect: And adds, ver. 18. For if the Inheritance be of the Law, it is no more of Promise: But God gave it to Abraham by Promise. Now, the Covenant made at Mount Sinai must be necessarily intended by the Law, which our latest and best Annotators compute to be 430 Years after the Establishment of the Covenant of Grace with Abraham, in Gen. xii. and the Law and Promise differ in Substance and Kind, being thus plainly distinguished each from other, as to conveying a right to the Heavenly Inheritance, whereof the literal Canaan was a Type, which is expressly ascrib'd to the one, but deny'd of the other. I might mention 2 Cor. Chap. iii. where, by the Letter, the Law, or Old Covenant, and by the Spirit, the Gospel, or New Covenant, as confirm'd and establish'd by the Death of the Testator, being evidently intended by the Apostle; the one being called the Ministration of Condemnation, as denouncing a condemnatory Sentence against all, as Transgressors; the other of Righteousness, as promising in a way of free Grace, Righteousness unto Life Eternal; these two are manifestly declared to be Covenants of a contrary Nature, and cannot therefore be the same Covenant, under different Administrations. Gal. iv. from ver. 21. to the end, is very full and clear, in Confirmation of the Proposition laid down: Where the Apostle informs us, that Hagar, the Bond-woman, was a Type of the Old Covenant, and Sarah, the Free-woman, of the New; that Ishmael, who was born after the Flesh, was a Type of the carnal or fleshly Seed, and Isaac, who was born by Promise, of the spiritual Seed; so that here were two distinct Covenants made with two different Seeds. And ver. 30. he assures us, that the first Covenant, and the carnal Seed, as typify'd by the Bond-woman, and her Son, were to be cast out; and that the Son of the Bond-woman, and carnal Seed, should not be Heirs with the spiritual Seed, of New Covenant-privileges; concluding, ver. 31. that we, viz. Gospel-believers, are not Children of the Bond-woman, that is, (as the Apostle himself had fully and plainly expounded it,) under the Mount Sinai Covenant; but of the free, that is, of the New Covenant, substantially different from it. From which, to me it appears very plainly, that the Covenant of Grace that Gospel-believers are now under, cannot be a Covenant of the same

same kind with that made with *Israel* at Mount *Sinai*, into which the carnal Seed were admitted; but that the carnal Seed are here expressly declared to be cast out, together with the *Sinai* Covenant.

But some will say, If the Covenant made with *Israel* at Mount *Sinai* be not a Covenant of the same kind with the Covenant of Grace, and that it promised Life only upon perfect Obedience, which none could attain to by it, as being unable to fulfil the Condition, how could any be saved that lived under that Covenant? And it would be severe and uncharitable indeed, to suppose that all perished, that lived from *Moses* to *Christ*. To which I answer: That many thousands were saved under that Covenant, I don't in the least doubt; but that any were saved by it, I deny. For Man, in his lapsed Estate, being utterly unable to yield perfect Obedience to the holy Law of God, and this Covenant strictly requiring it of all that would attain Righteousness and Life by it, no Man ever was or could be saved by it. But the Covenant of Grace, as first reveal'd to *Adam*, but afterwards more plainly to *Abraham*, and transacted with him in a peculiar manner, remain'd in force, was not, could not be disannulled, or made of none effect, by the giving forth of the Law, as the Apostle declares, *Gal. iii. 17*. And as before the Law, Righteousness and Life were attained by this Covenant, and since under the Gospel; so no less also in the time of the Law.

But some will ask, (as the Apostle foresaw) *To what end then serveth the Law?* To which he returns this Answer: *It was added because of Transgressions, till the Seed should come, to whom the Promise was made.* Whereby I conceive he intendeth, either, (1.) That the Lord designed by requiring perfect Obedience under the Penalty of so terrible a Curse, to lay a restraint upon the Lusts of that People, that, in a way becoming the Divine Wisdom and Holiness, they might remain a distinct People from other Nations, till the appointed time for the appearing of the *Messiah* among them, who was to come of the Seed of *Abraham* and *David*, and was to be known so to do, was accomplish'd. Or, (2.) It might be appointed to make a discovery of the greatness of Sin, and its Danger, that they might be convinced of the necessity they stood in of the *Messiah*, and that there was no way whereby they could receive a Deliverance from this Curse, but by the Obedience and Sacrifice of

Christ,

Christ, and thereby to direct their Faith to look for a real Atonement and Satisfaction by him; the Laws concerning Sacrifices, and all other legal Ceremonies, being added in a direct subserviency to the New Covenant or Testament, to be actually ratified and confirmed by the Testator's Death. And this end of the Law, as to the making a discovery of Sin, the Apostle declareth, *Rom. v. 20. Moreover the Law entered, that the Offence might abound.* This must not be understood as if the Design of the Law was to cause Sin to increase, for that was far from being the end of the Lawgiver, however it falls out through the Corruptions of Men: it being long since observed by one ignorant of Christ, that the Lusts of Men grew more impetuous, the more strict the Prohibitions were to restrain them from it.

Nititur in vetitum semper, cupimusque negata.

*Man, what he is forbidden, most requires,
And what he is deny'd, he most desires.*

The meaning therefore of the Apostle is, that the Law entered to make Sin manifest, and bring the Soul to see its Sins to be exceeding sinful, as in *Rom. vii. 7, 13.* I shall add, (3.) that another reason of its being transacted by God with that People, of whom Christ concerning the Flesh was to come, might be, that he being made under the Law, *Gal. iv. 4. might fulfil it for us.* Thus Mr. Petto, *Differ. between the Old and New Covenant*, p. 134. "I do not see how, by any visible Dispensation, Jesus Christ could have been born actually under the Law, if this Sinai Covenant had not been; for the Covenant of Works with the first Adam being violated, it was at an end, as to the promising part, it promised nothing after once it was broken; it remained in force only as to its threatening part, it menaced Death to all the sinful Seed of Adam, but admitted no other into it who were without Sin, either to perform the Righteousness of it, or to answer the Penalty, it had nothing to do with an innocent Person after broken, for it was never renewed with Man again as before. Therefore an admitting an innocent Person, as Jesus Christ was, into it, must be by some kind of repetition or renewing of it, tho' with other intendments than at first, viz. that the guilty Persons should not fulfil

“ fil it for themselves, but that another, a Surety should
 “ fulfil it for them. Some *medium*, or means, there must
 “ be, whereby this innocent Person, Jesus Christ, might
 “ be taken into it, and come under the very same Law
 “ that was broken, to fulfil the Righteousness, and satisfy
 “ or undergo the Penalty, which the Lord still required,
 “ without substantial abatement. Now in infinite Wisdom
 “ the Lord contrived this way of the *Sinai* Covenant, where-
 “ in *Israel*, who were guilty, by voluntary Compact and
 “ Agreement obliged themselves and their Seed to the per-
 “ fect Obedience which the Law required, and that under
 “ pain of the Curse; and Jesus Christ being born of their
 “ Seed, and under the *Sinai* Dispensation or Covenant, was
 “ born under the same Law which the guilty Persons were
 “ included in. I see not how this could have been, tho’ he
 “ had been born of the Seed of *Adam*, without this renew-
 “ ing of it at Mount *Sinai*. If he had not been born un-
 “ der the very Law as a Covenant of Works, and should
 “ not have satisfy’d it, by answering the Penalty, or fulfil-
 “ ling the Righteousness of it, but had only done and suf-
 “ fered something in lieu and stead thereof, it would
 “ not have been the *idem* for us; and this sheweth how
 “ exceeding necessary the *Sinai* Covenant was.

I might have shewed before, that *Moses* was the Media-
 tor of the former; but *Christ*, not *Moses*, the Mediator of
 the latter: the Sons of *Aaron* the Priests of the one, and
 our Blessed Lord only the High Priest of the other: clean
 Beasts and other Creatures appointed of God the Sacrifices
 of that, *Christ* himself the alone propitiatory Sacrifice in
 this. All which sufficiently evince them to be two distinct
 Covenants, and not one and the same under a different Ad-
 ministration. But I shall refer the Reader for a fuller De-
 monstration of the Truth of this Proposition to the excel-
 lent Treatise beforementioned, the Author of which being
 a Pedobaptist, his Words may probably on that account be
 more regarded. To what has been said therefore on this
 Head, I shall only add an Inference or two relating to our
 present Purpose.

1. Neither the Epithet *everlasting*, nor God’s promising
 in a Covenant to be *the God of the People* he admits into it,
 is sufficient to prove that Covenant to be the Covenant of
 Grace in *Christ Jesus*. The former we shall afterwards
 have occasion to treat off; and the latter is evident from
 hence,

Hence, that in the *Sinai* Covenant, yea in the very Preface to the Ten Commandments, the Lord declares himself to be a God to that People, *Exod. xx. 1, 2. And God spake all these Words, saying, I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the Land of Egypt, out of the House of Bondage.* And to this purpose are the Words of Dr. O. on *Heb. viii. ver. 10.* where speaking of that Promise, *I will be unto them a God, and they shall be my People*, he says, "This is the general Expression of any Covenant-relation between God and Men. And it is frequently made use of with respect unto the first Covenant, which yet was disannulled: God owned the People therein for his peculiar Portion, and they avouched him to be their God alone.

2. Hence we may learn that no good Plea can be taken from Infants Covenant-interest, and Church-membership under the *Sinai* Covenant, to warrant it under the New, for the Covenant's not being the same, but of a distinct kind, their being so in the one, will not prove them to be so in the other. And by the way, it may not be amiss to observe, that the *Jews* were not in Covenant, or Church-members, as being the Seed of Believers, the now pretended ground; but as the carnal Seed of *Abraham*, whatever their immediate Parents were. But to proceed, seeing the *Sinai* Covenant is abolished, and the Covenant of Grace established in the room of it, as the only Rule of the Church's Obedience, we can learn from thence only who are interested in it. Nor was it absolutely necessary to be expressly said that the Offspring of Believers are not so interested in the New Covenant, as they were in the Old; for the abolishing of this latter leaves us no reason to suppose the Subjects of it must necessarily be the Subjects of the former, of a quite different nature. If a Prince take away the Charter from a Corporation, and declare to them that he will give them a New one, of another Nature from the Old; they can't conclude what the Privileges of their new Charter will be, and who the Subjects to whom its Franchises shall belong, otherwise than by the Declaration of his Will to them; nor can his Subjects have any cause to complain of his leaving out of the New some particular Privileges, if he give them others in lieu thereof of far greater value, as it is in this Case.

PROP. V. Covenant-interest gives no Warrant for the Administration of a positive Institution, without the express Direction of a Divine Law.

Since our Pedobaptist Brethren generally look upon the Covenant made with *Abraham*, recorded *Gen. xvii. 7, &c.* to be the *Covenant of Grace*, the same in substance that believing Gentiles are now under, and also that Circumcision was the *Seal* of this Covenant; I shall endeavour to confirm the Proposition now laid down from their own Principles. But before we proceed to that, it may be worth observing, that notwithstanding the Covenant of Grace was in force from *Adam* to *Abraham*, as well as afterwards, tho' more obscurely revealed; yet during that long space of time, longer by several hundreds of Years than from the Birth of our Saviour to the present Age, there was no Ordinance appointed by God to be a Seal of the Interest of his People in this Covenant. And none will deny but many who had an Interest in the Covenant of Grace lived in that large Period of time. From hence therefore it appears, that a Right to a Seal doth not immediately result from an Interest in the Covenant; for if it had, the Believers of those times would have had such a Right. Nor will our Brethren suppose that the Righteous and Gracious God deny'd them what they had a just Right to. And this I presume will be granted, that God's Covenant-people had at that time no Ordinance, by him appointed for them, to be a Seal of their Covenant-interest, till the contrary be proved from Scripture.

But I come now to the Ordinance of Circumcision, which our Brethren suppose to be the Seal of the Covenant made with *Abraham*; and hope the following Considerations will make it sufficiently evident, that it was not Covenant-interest which gave any a Right to it. For, (1.) There were many eminent Men then living, who had an Interest in the Covenant of Grace, as well as *Abraham*, and yet no Right to Circumcision, the supposed Seal thereof; as *Shem*, the first Man of whom the Scripture, in so many Words, declareth, that *the Lord was his God*, *Gen. ix. 26.* and *Heber*, from whom the *Jews* had the Name of *Hebrews*; not to mention *Arphaxad*, *Salah*, and divers others of the antient postdiluvian Patriarchs; to whom I might add *Melchisedec*, who is declared, *Heb. vii.* to be greater than *Abraham*

ham himself, being both a King and a Priest. None of these had any more Right to Circumcision, than one that had never heard of the Covenant of Grace, unless they had dwelt in Abraham's Family. For the Sign of Circumcision was enjoined only upon Abraham himself, and his natural Male Offspring, and every Male born in his House, or bought with his Money, *Gen. xvii. 10, 11, 12, 13.* and there was no Command to affix it to any other. (2.) The Females also were in Covenant as well as the Males, and yet had no Seal or Sign appointed for them. And how incapable soever they were of Circumcision, the Sign appointed for the Males; yet if Covenant-interest had given a Right to a Seal, such a one whereof they had been capable would doubtless have been appointed for them. (3.) The Males were in Covenant from their Birth, and yet had no Right to Circumcision till the Eighth Day; and it would have been acting without a Divine Warrant, and plainly sinful, to have circumcised them before that time; as well as a Breach of God's Command, to have delay'd it longer. 'Twas not therefore Covenant-interest, but a positive Command which gave any a Right to Circumcision. I shall afterwards have occasion to mention several Instances of such, who by the Precept had a Right to this Ordinance, and were also actually circumcised (as *Ishmael* and *Esau*) and yet had no Interest in the Covenant made with *Abraham*. Nay all the Slaves in *Abraham's* House, born therein, or bought with his Money, had as much Right to it as his own Offspring; but that these were all interested in the Covenant of Grace by Faith, whoever shall assert, I am certain can never make it good from sacred Writ. Neither was any external Proof of it required of the Adult among them, as a Prerequisite to their Admission; and yet, some Years before this *Abraham* had 318 of them in his House, that were capable to bear Arms, *Gen. xiv.* I conclude then; since many in Covenant were not to be circumcised, and many not in Covenant were to be circumcised, 'twas not Covenant-interest that gave a Right to Circumcision, which our Brethren account to have been at that time the Seal of the Covenant of Grace.

PROP. VI. The Holy Spirit only is declared in Scripture to be the Seal of the Interest of the Lord's People in the Covenant of Grace.

The Truth of this Proposition will be evident from those Texts of Scripture, where the Sealing of Believers Interest in the Blessings of the Covenant of Grace is declared unto us. As *Eph. i. 13. In whom also, after that ye believed, ye were Sealed with the Holy Spirit of Promise. And Chap. iv. 30. And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are Sealed to the Day of Redemption. 2 Cor. i. 22. Who hath also Sealed us, and given us the Earnest of the Spirit in our Hearts.* And whereas one great use of a Seal is to ratify and confirm Deeds and Grants, and to give Evidence to the Person to whom such Grant is made, of his sure Right and Title to that which is convey'd thereby; so it is the Holy Spirit only that doth, or can give Assurance to Believers of their Interest in the New Covenant, *Rom. viii. 16. The Spirit itself also beareth Witness with our Spirits, that we are the Children of God.* And none surely will assert that Circumcision insur'd to all, on whom that Sign was affix'd by God's Command, an Interest in the Covenant of Grace. Had all the Natural Seed of *Abraham*, and all the Males in his House, the Promises of the New Covenant made good unto them? Were they all thereby assur'd of a Right and Title to Eternal Life? And was a real Interest in the Covenant of Grace confirm'd to all that were baptiz'd in the Primitive times? Was not *Simon Magus* baptiz'd, as well as *Simon Peter*, upon the Profession he made of his Faith? And yet the former had no Interest in the Covenant of Grace, being *in the gall of Bitterness, and bond of Iniquity, Acts viii. 13, 23.* Tho, I suppose, none will deny, but he had a just Right, *in foro Ecclesie, in the Church's Account*, to that Ordinance. So that if the Argument, so much insisted on by Pedobaptists, to give Countenance to their Practice, was granted them, *wz.* "All that have an Interest in the Covenant, have a Right to the Seal; Believers
"Infants have an Interest in the Covenant; therefore they
"have a Right to the Seal:" I say, if this was granted them, it would not evince the Right of Infants to Baptism, unless that could be proved to be the Seal of the Covenant, which I conceive can never be done from God's Word. But if I mistake not, both the Propositions are before proved to be wholly destitute of any Scripture foundation. Was this allow'd therefore, which they desire, that Baptism is the Seal of the New Covenant, it must first be prov'd that all in Covenant have a Right unto the Seal; and that
the

the Children of Believers, as such, have an Interest therein. If they fail in either of these, their Practice cannot be justify'd by this Argument; and if I mistake not, they must necessarily fail in the Proof of each of them from God's Word. I know *Rom. iv. 11.* is ordinarily produc'd for Proof, that Circumcision was a Seal of the Covenant of Grace; and *Col. ii. 11, 12.* that Baptism, succeeding in the room thereof, must have the same Use and End, that Circumcision formerly had.

As to *Rom. iv. 11.* it will upon examination fall very short of proving that Circumcision was a Seal unto the Carnal Seed, and Servants of *Abraham*, nay of his Posterity by *Isaac*, as such, of their Interest in the Covenant of Grace. For (1.) The Design of the Apostle in this Place is to shew, that God design'd to justify the uncircumcis'd *Gentiles* by Faith, as well as the circumcis'd *Jews*, which he doth by noting the time, wherein the All-wise God first instituted Circumcision, (wherein the Foundation of the *Jews* Separation from other Nations was laid) which he tells us was after *Abraham*, to whom the Command was first given, was justify'd. Whence he argueth, that the want of Circumcision could be no Bar to the Justification of the *Gentiles*, because *Abraham* himself was justify'd in his Uncircumcision; and thence shews, that God made Choice of that time to injoin Circumcision on him and his, for a Seal, or Confirmation to him, that God, in time to come, would justify the *Gentiles* by Faith in Christ, who was to come of his Seed, that he might stand in the Relation of a Spiritual Father to them also. And this Sense is plainly express'd in the translation of the Words by the Learned Dr. *Lightfoot*, in his *Hor. Hebraic.* Which he there shews not only to be the most proper to the Apostle's Design, but likewise to agree well with the Original. For, whereas we read, *ἐν τῇ ἀνεγκυρίᾳ*, which he being yet *Uncircumcis'd*, he reads, *which should be in the Uncircumcision*, i. e. his uncircumcis'd Seed, the *Gentiles*. So that Circumcision, as it was a Seal, was to confirm the Truth of the Promise of bringing in the *Gentiles* to be of the Seed of *Abraham*; which being accomplish'd, its End was attain'd, and no other Ordinance could take its Place, so as to seal the same Promises. And no one can suppose that Circumcision did seal, or confirm to its Subjects in general, or indeed to any but to *Abraham* himself, a paternal Relation to be-

believing *Gentiles*. But (2.) if we take the Words to intend, that Circumcision sealed to *Abraham* his own Personal Interest, as a Believer, in the Covenant of Grace, as well as his Relation of a Spiritual Father to believing *Gentiles*; it could not do so to his Infant-seed or Servants, as such, many of whom never had, either before, or after their Circumcision, such Faith in Evangelical Promises, who yet were the appointed Subjects of Circumcision as well as *Abraham* himself. Much less could it seal to them such a Paternal Relation, which it is here declar'd to do to him; this being a Prerogative granted to *Abraham* alone. Whence I conclude, that whatever Circumcision was at its first Institution, to the Father of the Faithful, it could not be a Seal in the Sense our Brethren plead it to have been to his carnal Seed, as such, afterwards. For had it been a Seal, or Confirmation, affix'd by God's Appointment, to their personal Interest in the Covenant of Grace unto all that were to be Circumcis'd, they must all have been eternally saved. For, as this Covenant is the great Charter whereby a Right to Eternal Life is given, none that ever had an Interest therein, fell short of such a Right, nor did any miss of attaining that, unto which God sealed to them such a Right. Moreover, (3.) the Apostle doth in the following Words most plainly declare, that there is an essential Difference between the Law (to which Circumcision belong'd) and those New Covenant promises that were made to *Abraham* for his Spiritual Seed, as *ver.* 13, 14, 15. For in *ver.* 12 he tells us who they are among the circumcis'd *Jews*, to whom *Abraham* stands in the Relation of a Spiritual Father, which he saith, *are they that walk in the Steps of that Faith Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcis'd*. Whence it appears, that the carnal Seed of *Abraham* himself were not, as such, his Spiritual Seed; much less can the carnal Seed of Believing *Gentiles* be accounted such, unless they walk in the Steps of *Abraham's* Faith. And then in the next Verse he adds; *For the Promise that he should be the Heir of the World, (i. e. the Father of the Faithful in all Parts of the World, which Sense best agrees with the Words and Scope of the place,) was not to Abraham, or his Seed, thro' the Law, but thro' the Righteousness of Faith; for if they who are of the Law be Heirs, Faith is made void, and the Promises made of none Effect, because the Law worketh Wrath*. And if the Law of *Moses*, or Covenant made

with the carnal Seed, be thus different in Kind from the Covenant of Faith, as the Apostle here declares ; and this Law, or Covenant (the first Lines whereof were drawn in that Covenant Transaction with *Abraham*, *Gen. xvii. 7, 8, 9.*) be that to which Circumcision belong'd in its ordinary Use, as one would think none should deny ; there can be no ground for any to assert, that the Covenant of Circumcision is the same that believing *Gentiles* are now under, unless the Law and the Gospel, Faith and Works, are one and the same.

As for *Col. ii. 11, 12.* *In whom also ye are circumcis'd with the Circumcision made without Hands, in putting off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh, by the Circumcision of Christ : Buried with him in Baptism, wherein also you are risen with him through the Faith of the Operation of God, who hath rais'd him from the Dead :* The Scope of the Apostle in this place is, to perswade these *Colossians* not to mix any thing with Christ in the Foundation of their Faith and Hope ; having in *ver. 10.* assur'd them that they were compleat in Christ. And lest any one should prevail upon them, to conclude that they stood in need of Circumcision, to render them more compleat ; he tells them, that in Christ they had attain'd the End of Circumcision, *in whom* (not in your selves) *also ye are circumcis'd with the Circumcision made without Hands, &c.* It cannot then be Baptism, as succeeding in the room of Circumcision, that he intends by their being circumcis'd in Christ, for that is perform'd by the Hands, as well as Circumcision. Yea, such a Notion of Baptism coming in the room of Circumcision, so as to have the same Use and End now, that Circumcision formerly had, directly opposeth the Apostle's Design in this place, as we may see immediately. His Intention then is, that *in Christ* they had attain'd that, which Circumcision mainly pointed at ; and this the Context (if I mistake not) sheweth to be Justification by that perfect Obedience to the Law, which Circumcision obliged to ; *Gal. v. 3.* That the Law promis'd the Divine Favour to none, but on the Condition of perfect Obedience, hath been prov'd already ; that Circumcision, the great Ordinance of the Law, bound its Subjects to perfect Obedience, is (I think) no less evident, it being therefore call'd an insupportable Yoke ; that this perfect Obedience could be yielded by none since the Fall, but Christ alone, must be granted ; and that he was therefore made

under the Law, *Gal. iv. 4.* that by yielding that perfect Obedience which the Law requir'd, he might work out a compleat Righteousness, wherein his People might be accepted with God, cannot (as I suppose) be question'd by any of those with whom I at present have to do. 'Tis therefore on this Account that they are said to be *the Circumcision, who rejoice, (i. e. place their whole Trust, as the Foundation of all their spiritual Peace and Comfort) in Christ Jesus, and have no Confidence in the Flesh, (i. e. in those carnal or fleshly Privileges that the Jews were so much inclin'd to confide in)* but look for all from Christ, as he was *the end of the Law for Righteousness to every one that believeth*, *Rom. x. 4.* It may also have a secondary respect to Sanctification (the Circumcision of the Heart) which always inseparably accompanieth Justification: And this also Christ is made unto his, *1 Cor. i. 30.* Not that their Sanctification consisteth in the Imputation of the Holiness of Christ's Person unto them, but as it was purchas'd for them by him; and the Principles of Grace are implanted, maintain'd, and increas'd in them by his Spirit, inabling them by Faith to derive cleansing Virtue from Christ crucify'd. But by *the Circumcision of Christ*, his perfect Obedience, whereof that was a Sign, seems primarily to be intended: And it is not unusual for the Sign to be put for the thing signify'd. That the Union and Fellowship of Believers with Christ in his Death and Resurrection, is represented in Baptism, wherein they are said to be *buried, and risen together with him*, is fully declar'd, *Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5, 6, &c.* And that they attain'd to it thro' the Faith of the Operation of God, is here asserted; the Design of the Apostle, in what he says as to Circumcision, which belong'd to the Old Covenant, being to convince them that they stood in no need of any Legal Shadows, which are now abolish'd, to render them more compleat, since the whole of what they were to rely upon, and all that was needful for them, was to be found in Christ. The continuance of Circumcision, or any Ordinance that should have the same Use and End, would be virtually a Denial that Christ was come, and had accomplish'd that whereof it was a Shadow. And their Baptism shews, they had profess'd to place their whole Trust in that Jesus, who *died for their Sins, and rose again for their Justification*; whose dying and rising as their Surety and Representative,

presentative, and the Benefit they partake of by it, is in a lively manner held forth therein. But for further Satisfaction, as to the Mind of the Spirit of God, both in *Rom. iv. 11.* and *Col. ii. 11, 12.* I would refer the Reader to the judicious Discourse written by Mr. N. Cox, intituled, *A Discourse of the Covenants which God made with Men before the Law. Chap. viii.* Where (if I mistake not) one that reads with an unprejudic'd Mind, will find it prov'd, that nothing is intended in these Texts that can give the least Countenance to Pedobaptism.

I come in the next place to consider the Covenant of Circumcision, as it was given to *Abraham, Gen. xvii. 7, &c.* Whereon my Antagonist chiefly relies for the defence of Pedobaptism. But that it does not yield the least Support to it, I hope to make fully appear, upon a due Search into what the Scripture declares concerning it. That there is a Repetition of the great Evangelical Promise given to *Abraham, Chap. xii. 3.* in the place abovemention'd, I readily grant; which the Apostle calls *the Promise, and the Gospel, Gal. iii.* And that 'tis to *Gen. xii. 3.* and not to *chap. xvii. 7.* to which the Apostle here refers, is evident from the time he says it was given before the Law, viz. 430 Years, as Mr. Pool's *Annotations* shew, not only in computing the time mention'd, *Gal. iii. 17.* which otherwise would have fallen short of that number about 24 Years; but likewise from many other plain Arguments, which I omit to mention. That the Place before us therefore contains a renewal of the Promise to *Abraham*, is not deny'd, which seems to have been necessary, before the establishing of the Covenant with him for his natural Offspring, that it might appear the former Grant was not disannull'd by it, but that the latter was to subserve the Ends of the former. But our present Enquiry is, of what Nature the Covenant is that God establish'd with *Abraham, ver. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14.* And in order thereunto, we must consider who are this Seed of *Abraham*, with whom it is made. That *Abraham* had a twofold Seed, the Scripture expressly tells us, the one carnal, and the other spiritual; the former, those that descended from his Loins; the latter, Heirs of the Blessings of the Covenant made with him for them thro' believing, being such that walk in the Steps of his Faith. And accordingly a twofold Covenant was made with him, the one for his natural Offspring, which yet extended not to them all, but

only to his Seed by *Isaac*, and was afterwards limited again to *Jacob* and his Posterity, *Ishmael* and *Esau* being expressly excluded; the other for his spiritual Seed, i. e. Believers of all Nations: the one promising temporal Blessings in the Land of *Canaan*; and the other spiritual and eternal Blessings, thro' Faith in the *Messiah*, who was to come of the Seed of *Abraham* according to the Flesh. And by the former that People was not only set apart from other Nations, for the bringing forth of the *Messiah*, that it might be known the Promise of God to *Abraham* was fulfill'd, that he should come of his Seed, and receiv'd their typical Institutions pointing at Christ, and the Work that was to be accomplish'd by him at his coming; but likewise some Ages after the Decease of *Abraham*, had the singular Privilege of the Old Testament granted them, as also the first tenders of Gospel-grace after the coming of the *Messiah*. But all these Advantages came far short of the better Promises of the Covenant, made with him for his spiritual Seed, whereby Grace here, and Glory hereafter, is insur'd to all who have the Happiness to be included in it. And that it was his natural Seed, and Household-servants, even all the Males without Distinction, whether they were his spiritual Seed or no, that were to be circumcis'd, none can modestly deny. Wherefore this Covenant, whereof Circumcision was the Sign, was the Covenant made with *Abraham* for his natural Offspring. For, although it was to be affix'd on as many of *Abraham's* spiritual Seed, as were his natural Seed also; yet to none upon the former, but only on the latter Account. But as it pleas'd God to appoint all the Males to be circumcis'd, that sprang from *Abraham* by *Isaac* and *Jacob*, to whom he gave, in the appointed Season, all the Blessings promis'd in that special Covenant made with him; it was his Sovereign Pleasure also to appoint them to be the Subjects of this Ordinance, who had no real Interest in the Blessings of that Covenant. For *Ishmael* and *Esau* were by the Command of God to be circumcis'd, who were yet before their Circumcision excluded from any Share therein. Neither did Circumcision convey any Right to the Bondmen among the *Jews*, to share with the Circumcis'd *Jews* in the Inheritance of *Canaan*, one great Blessing promis'd in the Covenant here establish'd with *Abraham*. Which further shews, what I said before, that Covenant-interest

interest was not the adequate Rule, and proper ground of the Administration of Circumcision, but the express Revelation of the Sovereign Pleasure of the Lawgiver. Yet as it was to be administered to the carnal Seed, as such, whether their immediate Parents were Believers or no; and one great End of it being the Separation of the Body of the *Israelitish* Nation from all other Nations, for the Production of the *Messiah* among them; we have reason to conclude, it was the carnal Seed of *Abraham*, under the Limitations and Restraints before mention'd, for whom this Covenant was establish'd with him. And consequently the Covenant at *Sinai*, which was afterwards made the intire Rule of Obedience to the National Church of the *Jews*, during that Dispensation, was in pursuance of the Promises here made to *Abraham* for them; so that this must be of the like Nature with that, which we have before prov'd to differ in Substance and Kind from the Covenant of Grace. And that there is no reason from the great Promise here made of the Lord's being the God of this Seed, or from its being call'd an Everlasting Covenant, to conclude it to be the Covenant of Grace in *Christ Jesus*, into which believing *Gentiles* are admitted, is evident from what hath been already shewn, with respect to the *Sinai* Covenant; wherein also the Lord declared himself to be the God of the *Jewish* Nation, and that Covenant is declared to be *Everlasting*, the meaning of which Term will afterwards be further explain'd.

But after all that has been said to the contrary, should it be granted to our Pedobaptist Brethren, that the Covenant which God here maketh with *Abraham* and his Seed, is the Covenant of Grace, which I can see no reason for, then who are this Seed of *Abraham*? It must surely be the Spiritual Seed, since it cannot be consistent with sound Doctrine to assert that the Covenant of Grace is established with any others, because the sure Promises thereof are fulfilled to them only. And we know that *Abraham's* carnal Seed, as such, were not interested therein. We have no account in holy Writ, how it far'd in this respect with any more than two of his immediate Sons, *Ishmael* and *Isaac*, and but one of those two was of his spiritual Seed. And of the *Jews*, his mediate Seed, that sprang from him in after Generations, for whom this Covenant was established with him, and who were as much interested in the Promises

ses thereof as his immediate Seed, as appears from the very Words wherein this Covenant is transacted, *With him and with his Seed after him in their Generations* ; of these, I say, the Apostle declares, that *altho' they were as the Sand of the Sea, yet a Remnant only was saved*, Rom. ix. 27. which all in the Covenant of Grace are. Which is also further evident from ver. 6, 7, 8. of the same Chap. *For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel : Neither because they are the Seed of Abraham, are they all Children, but in Isaac shall thy Seed be called : that is, they which are the Children of the Flesh, these are not the Children of God ; but the Children of the Promise are counted for the Seed.* Altho' I would not write after my Antagonist's Copy, and insinuate his giving the flat Lie to these, with many other Texts of the same import ; yet I must say, he cannot assert the Interest of the Seed of Believers, as such, in the Covenant of Grace, without directly contradicting the plain Words and Sense of these and such like Scriptures. Those who according to the Meaning of these and many other Scriptures, are called the Children of God, are such that stand in a new Covenant-relation to him ; and it is to them that God hath promised *he will be a Father, and they shall be his Sons and Daughters*, 2 Cor. vi. ult. And the Apostle saith, *The Children of the Flesh (i. e. as such, or on that account) are not the Children of God, (standing related to him as such in the Covenant of Grace) neither because they were Abraham's natural Seed, are they so related to him as his Children.* If then all Abraham's own natural Seed, that sprang from his Loins, were not his spiritual Seed ; it is impossible for any Man to prove that the natural Seed of Believers, as such, are Abraham's spiritual Seed. Do Believers, by the Right which they derive from Abraham, convey a greater Privilege to their Children, than he did to his own Offspring according to the Flesh ? Either then the Plea must be laid aside for the Children of Believers Right to Baptism, from their being in that respect interested in the Covenant of Grace, and some other Bottom found out to build it upon, or the Cause Mr. H. hath undertaken to defend, must fall to the ground. And that, if it be the Covenant of Grace which is here made with Abraham, as our Brethren contend, none other but the spiritual Seed of Abraham are meant, is owned by the Learned and Pious Dr. O. in his Book intituled, *The Doctrine of the Saints Perseverance*, &c. Chap. 4. Sect. 3. p. 96. where

where endeavouring to confirm that great Doctrine of Final Perseverance from the Covenant of Grace, the first Place produced by him for that end is *Gen. xvii. 7.* By which we may be assured he look'd upon no other really interested in that Covenant, but what should finally persevere and attain Eternal Life. But I shall give you his own Words. "This is that, which God ingageth himself unto in this Covenant of Grace, that he will for *everlasting* be a God to him and to his faithful Seed: Tho' the external Administration of the Covenant was given to *Abraham* and his carnal Seed (which, if we may take it for the Tenders of the Grace thereof, as he seems to explain himself in the Place before cited, *Exp. Vol. 3.* is readily granted) yet the effectual Dispensation of the Grace of the Covenant is peculiar to them only, who are the Children of the Promise, the Remnant of *Abraham* according to Election, with all that in all Nations were to be blessed in him, and in his Seed *Jesus Christ*. *Ishmael*, tho' circumcised, was to be put out, and not to be Heir with *Isaac*; nor to abide in the House for ever, as the Son of the Promise was. Now the Apostle tells you, look what Blessings faithful *Abraham* received by virtue of this Promise, the same do all Believers receive, *Gal. iii. 9.* which he proves in the Words foregoing from *Gen. xii. 3.*" And as to the two-fold Seed of *Abraham*, carnal and spiritual, before describ'd, and the distinct Covenants establish'd with him for them, the same *Interpreter*, in his *sixth Exercit.* prefix'd to his *first Volume* on the *Hebrews*, speaks very fully in these Words, *P. 55.* "In process of time God was pleased to confine this Church, as to the ordinary visible Dispensation of his Grace, to the Person and Posterity of *Abraham*. Upon this Restriction of the Church-covenant and Promise, the *Jews* of old managed a Plea in their own Justification, against the Doctrine of the Lord Christ and his Apostles. *We are the Children, the Seed of Abraham*, was their continual Cry; on the account whereof they presumed that all the Promises belonged unto them, and upon the Matter to them alone. And this their Perswasion hath cast them, as we shall see, upon a woeful and fatal Mistake." And it may deserve the serious Thoughts of our Pedobaptist Brethren, whether their asserting, that their Children, as such, are interested in the Covenant of Grace, doth not tend to cast their Posterity into the same fatal Mistake.

But

But he adds, "Two Privileges did God grant unto *Abraham*,
 " upon his Separation to a special Interest in the old Promise
 " and Covenant:

" 1. That according to the Flesh he should be the Fa-
 " ther of the *Messiah*, the promised Seed, who was the
 " very Life of the Covenant, the Fountain and Cause of all
 " the Blessings contained in it. That this Privilege was
 " temporary, having a limited Season, Time and End ap-
 " pointed to it, the very Nature of the thing it self
 " doth demonstrate; for upon his actual Exhibition in
 " the Flesh it was to cease. In pursuit hereof, were his
 " Posterity separated from the rest of the World, and pre-
 " served a peculiar People, that through them the promi-
 " sed Seed might be brought forth in the Fulness of Time,
 " and be of them, according to the Flesh, *Rom. ix. 5.*

" 2. Together with this, he had also another Privilege
 " granted unto him, namely, that his Faith, whereby he
 " was personally interested in the Covenant, should be the
 " Pattern of the Faith of the Church in all Generations;
 " and that none should ever come to be a Member of it, or
 " a Sharer in its Blessings, but by the *same Faith* which he
 " had fixed on the Seed, that was in the Promise, to be
 " brought forth from him in the World. On the account
 " of this Privilege, he became the Father of all them that
 " do believe; for *they that are of the Faith, the same are*
 " *the Children of Abraham, Gal. iii. 7. Rom. iv. 11.* as also
 " *Heir of the World, Rom. iv. 13.* in that all that should
 " believe throughout the World, being thereby implanted
 " into the Covenant made with him, should become his
 " spiritual Children.

" Answerable to this twofold End of the Separation of
 " *Abraham*, there was a double Seed allotted to him: A
 " Seed according to the Flesh, separated to the bringing
 " forth of the *Messiah* according to the Flesh; and a Seed
 " according to the Promise, that is, such as by Faith should
 " have Interest in the Promise, or all the Elect of God.
 " Not that these two Seeds were always subjectively divers,
 " so that the Seed separated to the bringing forth of the
 " *Messiah* in the Flesh, should neither in whole nor in part
 " be also the Seed according to the Promise; or on the
 " contrary, that the Seed according to the Promise should
 " none of it be his Seed after the Flesh. Our Apostle de-
 " clareth the contrary in the Instances of *Isaac* and *Jacob*,
 " with

" with the Remnant of Israel that should be saved, Rom. ix.
 " 10, 11. But sometimes the same Seed came under divers
 " Considerations, being the Seed of *Abraham* both accord-
 " ing to the Flesh and according to the Promise ; and some-
 " times the Seed it self were divers, those according to the
 " Flesh being not of the Promise, and so on the contrary.
 " Thus *Isaac* and *Jacob* were the Seed according to the
 " Flesh, separated to the bringing forth of the *Messiah* after
 " the Flesh, because they were his carnal Posterity ; and
 " they were also of the Seed of the Promise, because by
 " their own personal Faith, they were interested in the
 " Covenant of *Abraham* their Father. Multitudes after-
 " wards were of the carnal Seed of *Abraham*, and of the
 " number of the People separated to bring forth the *Mes-*
 " *siah* in the Flesh, and yet were not of the Seed accord-
 " ing to the Promise, nor interested in the spiritual Blef-
 " sings of the Covenant, because they did not personally
 " believe, as our Apostle declares, *Chap. iv. of this Epistle.*
 " And many afterwards, who were not of the carnal Seed
 " of *Abraham*, nor interested in the Privilege of bringing
 " forth the *Messiah* in the Flesh, were yet designed to be
 " made his spiritual Seed by Faith, that in them he might
 " become Heir of the World, and all Nations of the Earth
 " be blessed in him. Now it is evident, that it is the se-
 " cond Privilege and spiritual Seed, wherein the Church,
 " to whom the Promises are made, is founded, and where-
 " of it doth consist ; namely, in them who by Faith are
 " interested in the Covenant of *Abraham*, whether they
 " be of the carnal Seed or no." These Words are so plain
 " and full, needing no Comment to assert and prove, that
 " those only who by their own personal Faith have an Interest
 " in that better Covenant, and not *Abraham's* carnal Seed, as
 " such, were his spiritual Seed ; that if the bold Assertions
 " of Mr. *H.* be laid in the ballance against 'em, they will be
 " found of no weight. And as only Believers are the spiritual
 " Seed of *Abraham*, there can be no fair Pretence made that
 " other Believers stand in the Relation of such a Covenant-
 " head to their Offspring, as *Abraham* to both his Seeds.
 " Even those of their Seed, who when grown up appear to be
 " Believers, and thereby stand related to *Abraham* as his spi-
 " ritual Seed, who had that peculiar Honour confer'd on
 " him, to be the Pattern of Faith to all the Faithful after him ;
 " they, I say, tho' standing thus related to *Abraham* by vir-
 " tue

tue of the Covenant here transacted with him, cannot however justly be called the spiritual Seed of their own immediate believing Parents on the same account, God having made no such Covenant with them, whereby they can claim a paternal Relation to them on that score. For any to argue, that because in this Covenant God promised to be *a God to Abraham and his Seed in their Generations*, therefore the same Promise is made to ordinary believing Parents, is a discovery that little or no due Thought hath been exercised on the peculiar Prerogative granted to *Abraham*, that others should derive their Claim from him, both to the Blessings of the first and second Covenant; his carnal Seed, as such, to the one; and his spiritual Seed, as such, unto the other.

If then any one would prove that the Offspring of Believers, as such, are interested in the Covenant of Grace, tho' what is so much contended for was granted, which, as I said before, I see no reason to do, *viz.* that the Covenant made with *Abraham*, *Gen. xvii. 7.* is the Covenant of Grace; he is yet obliged to shew, that the carnal Seed of Believers, as such, are the spiritual Seed of *Abraham*. And his own immediate carnal Seed, as such, not being his spiritual Seed, nor any of them upon that account interested in the Covenant of Grace, it must in the Issue (if I am not greatly mistaken) prove a fruitless Attempt; for he will find himself confuted by express Testimonies of Holy Scripture, and his own daily Observation.

I shall now proceed to give a brief and just Account of what *Mr. H.* pretends to offer to the contrary. Although, if the Premises already laid down, be substantially prov'd from the Scripture, as I take them to be, the chief Foundation on which he builds the Practice he contends for, is effectually destroy'd. And the most of his Arguments also being advanc'd to prove, that God made the Covenant of Grace with *Abraham*, (which the Antipedobaptists own no less than himself) we are very little concern'd in them; for that Position may be, and is granted, but yet his Inference thence deduc'd, deny'd. And he must either have been very ignorant of the true State of the Controversy between us, and therefore unfit to undertake a Decision of it; or else have purposely left himself at liberty to argue at so loose a rate, that the less knowing Readers might think he had gain'd his Point, by proving that which the Scrip-
ture

ture plainly asserts, and we, as well as himself, own and affirm. For they that know little of this Controversy, may well be supposed to imagine (as 'tis likely he hop'd) that a Man who writes with so great Assurance, would not so bestir himself to prove that which is not deny'd by those he opposeth; tho' at the same time it can't but seem very odd to others that he should do so. That God made the Covenant of Grace with *Abraham*, and his spiritual Seed, is granted. That the Offspring of Believers, as such, are of the number of this spiritual Seed, is deny'd; and if Mr. *H.* assert it a thousand times over, he can never prove it from Scripture, or by any just Consequences thence deduc'd. And it may well seem strange to any one, that a Person in this Age, should publish a Discourse to the World concerning the Promises made to *Abraham* and his Seed, and never take notice of the Distinction made by those against whom he contends, between the carnal and spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, which is also allow'd by the most noted Writers of the Pedobaptists, and without which the federal Transactions of God with *Abraham* can never be rightly understood.

CHAP. I.

REMARKS on Mr. H's INTRODUCTION.

I Can readily subscribe to the whole of his *first* Paragraph; it being unquestionably our Duty to buy the Truth and sell it not, &c. But this can no way justify the Undertaking of Mr. *H.* unless what he here contends for be the Truth, and the Doctrine we meet with in his Plea be agreeable to the Faith once delivered to the saints; which nothing I meet with in his *Treatise* gives me the least Satisfaction in; and the Reasons why I cannot so esteem it, the Reader will find in my *Answer* insuing.

The *second* Paragraph begins with the Declaration of his intention to avoid giving Offence as much as possible. I am willing to exercise as much Charity as possibly I can; and would therefore hope he might have some such Purpose at his first Entrance on this Work, how little discovery soever he

he hath made of it in the Work it self. Tho' it may seem strange, that a Man should warm himself to that degree in the pursuit of an Argument his own voluntary Inclination engaged him in, as not only totally to forget his first good Intentions, but in many places to write more like one that designed to offend, than one that would use the likeliest Means to convince. He adds, *or at least to moderate or cool the Spirits of such, who are apt to be offended with those that plead the Cause of Infants; which yet is an Act both of Justice and Mercy, because they can't plead for themselves.* He is very unlikely to quench a Fire, who takes pains to add more Fuel to it. And if Mr. H. would have attempted to make others cool and moderate, he should have addressed himself to that Work in a Temper better suited to produce that Frame in them, than what appears in his Discourse. But Men are subject to heighten the Failings of others, and overlook their own. If the Plea he here makes for Infants be, as he saith, an Act of Justice and Mercy, they must be very unreasonable that will take offence at it, which I persuade my self none will do, to whom it so appears. If it be an Act of Justice, what he pleads for must be that which God's Word giveth them a Right unto; and if an Act of Mercy, it must tend to profit, not indanger them. But that his Plea doth not, on either of these accounts, deserve the Commendation himself gives it, will (as I think) appear in the Examination of it. But to make us more cool and moderate he propounds four things in general, as he saith, for us to consider of in the Fear of God, touching this Controversy.

The Substance of the First is this: *That it is a far greater Evil to deny Baptism to Infants, if they have a Right to it, than it can be to baptize them if they have none; because it is much safer to err on the side of Love and Mercy, than of Uncharitableness and Cruelty.*

But 'tis certainly not our Duty to let Charity so far prevail, as to bias the Judgment, and overcome some Scruples of the Mind about the Warrantableness of the Practice he contends for. And he would do well to remember, that *that which is not of Faith is Sin*, Rom. xiv. ult. and that *Love should abound in Knowledge*, Phil. i. 9. and be a *Fruit of Faith*, Gal. v. 6. But now I shall consider, first his Position, and then his Reason. For the Position; tho I own it to be sinful to omit what God requireth; yet I see not but it is sinful

sinful to practise that as a part of God's Worship, which is no where appointed by him. The Lord himself hath shewn as great Marks of his Displeasure against doing that which he commanded not, as against neglecting to obey him in the Duties prescrib'd by him; as in the Instance of *Nadab and Abihu*, Lev. x. 1, 2. and he severely reproveth the *Israelites* afterwards for doing that which he had not commanded, Jer. vii. 31. xix. 5. & xxxii. 35. And our Lord, in the close of the Canon of Holy Scripture, as severely threatneth them that add to his Word, as those who take from it, Rev. xxii. 18. And it is plain from the Nature of the thing it self, that it is no less criminal to usurp the Authority of the Legislator, in making Laws, than to contemn it, by neglecting to obey those made by him. Let none then from hence be prevail'd upon to do that as a part of Divine Worship, which they can see no good ground from God's Word to believe it is his Will should be perform'd; lest they stand speechless when the Lord shall demand, *Who hath requir'd this of your hands?* and come under the severe Reprehension of our Saviour, *In vain do ye worship me, teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men*, Matth. xv. 9.

But I must now consider his Reason. If he supposeth we err in Practice, he must err on the side of *Uncharitableness*, if he judge it not to proceed from an Error in Judgment. And to call an Error in Judgment (if it was so) which a Man cannot help, by the harsh Names of *Cruelty* and *Uncharitableness*, favours more of that which he calls so great an *Evil*, than that on which he bestows those hard Names. Those he calls *Anabaptists*, have a natural Affection for their Offspring, as well as he, and would be as unwilling to debar them of any Privilege, which our dear Lord hath granted them in his holy Word; but dare not, under the Pretence of *Charity*, apply an Ordinance to them, which Christ never appointed for them. It very ill deserves the Name of *Charity*, for a Parent to perswade his Child that he hath a firm Title to a large Estate, and thereby cause him to neglect securing his Title to it, till all Offers of conveying such a Right are ended. And I have often thought, that believing Parents informing their Children that they are interested with them in the Covenant of Grace, which is *sure* and *Everlasting*, instead of being an Act of *Charity*, proceeding from Judg-

ment and Understanding, as all such Acts ought to do, may be a sorrowful Means to cause them to neglect securing to themselves an Interest in it. Tho' I desire to exercise more *Charity*, than to charge our Brethren, the Pedobaptists, with *Cruelty* and *Uncharitableness*; however Mr. H. deals by us. But I look upon them, how well qualify'd soever in other respects, to act herein from Mistake; and those who are moderate among them make the same Construction of our Dissent from them in this matter.

The second thing he thus solemnly proposeth to us to consider, is, *What it is we are so ready to be angry at, and strive against.* Is it (saith he) some great Loss or Damage to your selves or Children? Or is it not really the greatest Privilege, next to that of your own Salvation, that believing Parents can enjoy, either for themselves, or Seed; and that which alone can quiet and comfort them concerning their dying Infants?

Such is Mr. H's *Charity*, that he can readily call it Anger for the Antipedobaptists to express their Dissent from him: when at the same time he makes very free with their Opinion, condemning it as *cruel* and *uncharitable*. That it must be own'd that too much Heat has sometimes appear'd in the Writings of both Parties upon this Controversy, a Fault as little justifiable as common in most polemical Discourses. For why should those who have one Father, and are Heirs of the same Inheritance, be offended with one another because their Understandings were not all cast in one Mould? It would displease us to see our Children angry with each other, because their Bodies are not of equal Stature. I have at his desire consider'd what he here proposes to us; and tho' I am not angry with my Brethren, for not being of the same Mind with me in this Point; yet, upon deliberate Thoughts, not being able to discern that the Children of Believers, as such, have an Interest in the Covenant of Grace, (as I hope the impartial Reader will find afterwards demonstrated) I cannot but fear it may prove very prejudicial to persuade them it is so, by causing them to think themselves in a safe and happy Condition, when indeed they are *Children of Wrath*, as well as others, and without passing under the new Birth must inevitably perish eternally. But as to the greatness of the Privilege which he says we strive against,

gainst, I cannot learn by reading his *Treatise*, what real Privilege he assigns them, more than the Antipedobaptists. He will say, Is it not a real Privilege of the highest Nature to be interested in the Covenant of Grace? I readily grant it; for, as the Blessings promis'd in that Covenant are of the greatest Value, so they are sure to every one who is taken into that happy Relation to God, as *Jer. xxxii. 40.* But what kind of Interest he allots them in it, the Reader will hardly be able to find by his Book? For, by comparing *Page 71.* and *72.* 'twill appear, that tho' he accounts them *in Covenant*, yet he looks upon them not to be *in Christ*; for *Page 71.* he thinks *Christ is not meant by the Root, Rom. 11. because none are naturally in him*; and in *Page 72.* he understands it to be the *Covenant of Promise, which God establish'd with Abraham, and his Seed*; and contends earnestly that *Believers Children, as such, are natural Branches in it.* This is such a being in the new Covenant, as I cannot find the least hint of in the Holy Scriptures. To be *in Covenant*, and not *in Christ*, appears to me to be new and strange Doctrine. Christ is said to be *given of the Father for a Covenant of the People. Isa. lii. 6.* And the Covenant is establish'd with him for the Seed in Covenant, *Psal. lxxxix. 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, &c.* My Mercy will I keep for him (my first born) for evermore, and my Covenant shall stand fast with him, his Seed also will I make to endure for ever.--- If his Children forsake my Law, and walk not in my Judgments,--- I will visit their Transgressions with the Rod;--- Nevertheless my loving Kindness will I not utterly take from him, &c. And hence it is that they only, who are *in Christ*, partake of the great Blessings of the Covenant, Pardon of Sin, and Freedom from that Condemnation Sin hath brought all under. Compare *Rom. v. 18.* with *viii. 1.* and *Jer. xxxi. 34.* 'Tis in Christ the Promises of the Covenant are ratify'd and confirm'd, *2 Cor. i. 20.* For all the Promises of God in him are Yea, and in him, Amen, unto the Glory of God by us. His Notion of being *in the Covenant of Grace*, and not *in Christ*, the Mediator and Surety of it, is directly contrary to *Gal. iii. 29.* If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's Seed, and Heirs according to the Promise. And when he speaks of their being *in Covenant*, it is no other Interest therein which he assigns them, than what they may, and many of them do fall off from, and perish eternally.

And how this alone should *quiet and comfort Believers concerning their dying Infants*, is not easy to understand. But he will say, Is it not a great Privilege to be Members of Christ's visible Church and Kingdom? And that they are so, is what he very much endeavours to persuade us to the Belief of. But designing to treat of this more particularly afterwards, I shall only say here, that I know of no Privilege peculiarly belonging to Church-members, which he ascribes to them. If he say, he is for their being on that account admitted to Baptism, which we deny them; my Answer is, that Baptism cannot justly be esteem'd a Privilege, unless appointed for them; which could we be convinc'd of, we should as readily admit them to it, as he can desire. And Church-membership is so far from being a ground of their Admission to Baptism, that the Apostles first baptis'd, and then admitted to Membership with the Church, *Acts ii. 40, 41*. But further; Where is the *Cruelty and Uncharitableness* in our Opinion, if the *Covenant-interest*, and *Church-membership* (which he pretends to) be indeed so great a Privilege, as he accounts it; and their Right thereto as certain, as he would persuade us; where is the Damage in our shewing the Reasons that we cannot discern it so to be? Will that revoke any Grant that God hath made them, and destroy such Interest, if they are possess'd of it? This cannot be. *If we believe not, yet he abideth faithful, 2 Tim. ii. 13*. And Men's *Unbelief maketh not the Faith of God* (*i. e.* his Faithfulness) *without Effect, Rom. iii. 3*. But on the other hand, the affirming them to be in Covenant, &c. may be greatly prejudicial (as was shew'd before) if in truth they are not. And that there is as much *Charity*, yea more, in our Opinion concerning Infants, than in his, may further appear afterwards.

As to the *third Thing*, when he asks, *What is it you are so pleas'd with?* I answer; A Prospect of Truth's prevailing against Error. And when he adds, *What is it you contend so earnestly for?* My Reply is; The Faith once deliver'd to the Saints, and Purity of Worship appointed by God, which he here opposeth, and which the Command of our Lord hath made our Duty, tho' he is pleas'd to call it a *contending for nothing*. And I can't but observe here the little Artifice he useth to expose us to the hard Thoughts of our Brethren, who differ from us in this Point; yea, and

and of our own Children also, when arriv'd to Years of Understanding ; suggesting that *we contend to have them Members of Satan's Kingdom, and Strangers to the Covenant of Promise* ; which contains as much of Truth, as his Discourse in general discovers of *Charity*. For our earnest Request to God for them is, that they may be deliver'd out of that deplorable Estate. And when he says *our Zeal is cruel, that we are unkind Parents, and our Infants are to be pitied upon that account* ; it needs a more favourable Interpretation than he commonly gives of what we do and say, to think that he design'd not to prejudice our own Offspring against us ; but I would hope better concerning him.

I come now to the *fourth Thing*, where he asks, *If you carry the Day, what is it you gain ?* To which he replies, *Just nothing* ; adding, *But if the Truth be found to be on our side, and you yield to it, then ye gain very much both for your selves and Seed*. What those who are of Mr. H's Opinion gain, either to *themselves or Seed*, more than we, I shall leave the Reader to judge from what has been said in Answer to the *second Thing* propos'd by him.

When he endeavours to dissuade from *spreading of what is written by Antipedobaptists on this Subject*, which he wrongfully says is *against Infants, and their Privileges* ; he would not, I perswade my self, it should be interpreted by the Favourers of the Cause he pleads, as a Reprehension of their greater Zeal in *spreading his Treatise*.

When he proceeds to tell us, *he has often wonder'd, every thing we meet with that strengthens our Opinion, should not bring a Damp upon our Spirits* ; is there not more reason to wonder it should not have that Effect upon him, to observe that, notwithstanding he has ventur'd to assert *all the Infants of Believers interested in the Covenant of Grace*, many of them sadly discover they never had the true Fear of God in their Hearts, by which means the Parents find themselves miserably disappointed ? And 'tis well if some of their Offspring from such Doctrine don't flatter themselves with a groundless Confidence, having heard, that those once in Covenant are ever so. And I must say, he hath shewn as little Regard to prevent any thing of that nature, as I ever observ'd in any Writing of this Kind. A little more Care of Children would well have become one, who so severely condemns others of *Unkindness* to them.

As to what he speaks of *clapping of Wings, and crowing*, when we get a believing Parent to reject and condemn all that Faith in, and Comfort which he had once from the Word and Promise of God concerning his Children; and to take up hard Thoughts of his Infants; yea, and of our Lord himself, as if he would not indure the Infants of his People to come near him in the Church, or have any Relation to him as Lambs of the Flock, &c. I shall leave him to please himself with the trifling Metaphors of *clapping of Wings, and crowing*, and only say, that I know not but there may be sometimes too much appearance of Vain-glory on both sides, upon a suppos'd Advantage of their Cause, which is but too common on such accounts, and all would do well to avoid. Nor dare I allow my self to think he is arriv'd at such a pitch of *Uncharitableness*, as to conclude, that we would have any to *contemn the Faith and Comfort which they have receiv'd from the Word and Promises of God*; or, that we take up *harder Thoughts*, than God's Word (if we understand it right) directs us to, of our Children; much less that we dare think *hardly of our dearest Lord*, for any thing reveal'd by him concerning them; how unhappy soever he may have been in his Expressions. And I think my self oblig'd to desire him to beware lest he take Fancy for Faith, and Comfort to himself, when God speaks it not to him; and that he conclude not, that our Lord hath admitted the Infants of Believers, as such, to Membership in his Church, from an ungrounded Imagination that otherwise he would have dealt hardly with them.

He doth not seem to have consider'd well what he says, when he talks of our *setting up a Calf, and dancing about it*; for if he had, he must have remember'd, that the making and dancing about the Calf in the Wilderness, to which he there alludes, was an act of Worship devis'd by Men, and none, that I know of, condemn our Practice of adult Baptism as such. But the Task he hath undertaken, obligeth him to free his own Practice from meriting that Character.

What he says in the following Paragraph of the *wonted Evangelion of the invisible Church*, shall be consider'd in the next Chapter. But I can't omit to observe how improper his alleging Deut. xxix. 29. is to prove the *Case of Infants no Secret*; tho' he seems to have thought this Passage very much to his Purpose, by inserting it in his Title Page. But how-

however the thing be in it self, as to the Revelation of God's Mind, touching the State of new born Infants, yet this place is very far from declaring it to us; for by Children here, our Posterity, when grown up to be capable of understanding that Revelation, must necessarily be intended; till then it can no way belong to them as an appointed Means of their Instruction, but only to their Parents: And Persons, when grown up to 30 or 40 Years of Age, tho' they may be capable of understanding it much sooner, are still the Children of their natural Parents, as well as when in their Infant State. And this Consideration, duly attended to, may give us some light into the true Meaning of many Scriptures, which he produces to give Countenance to his Cause.

As to his Citation out of the *Epistle* of Dr. Thomas Goodwin, prefix'd to Mr. Cotton's Book of *Infant Baptism*, to justify his *Call to this Undertaking*; I shall only say, That altho' I have a very high Esteem of the *Doctor*, yet I see nothing offer'd by him in these Lines, to convince me 'tis the Will of God that Infants should be baptiz'd, and we have no Warrant, *Jurare in verba Magistri*, To pin our Faith on any Man's Sleeve. Tho' I could wish Mr. H. and some others of the same Perswasion with him, would tread in the *Dr's* Steps, as to the Christian Love, and Moderation he shew'd (as I have been very credibly inform'd) towards his Brethren who differ'd from him in this Point. I shall only add, that it appears to me somewhat strange for Mr. H. to justify his own appearing as a publick Advocate in this Cause, from those Words of the *Dr.* where he saith, "That the Vindication of the Right of Infants deserves, and challengeth the choicest Abilities of the Divines of this Age." For it cannot be well consistent with Modesty, for him to account himself so qualify'd, as the *Dr.* says the Cause requireth. And I would desire him to beware of building any great Expectation upon his following Words, of a *Reward from Christ*, for this his Undertaking, at the last Day; lest he then find himself disappointed, and this Work of his prove but Hay and Stubble, which shall be burnt, and he suffer the loss of it.

In the next Place, he accounts for his citing of many Texts, without writing of the Words at length; to which I need only say, that I believe those who will be at the pains of consulting them, will be apt to conclude, he might as

well have omitted most of the References themselves, as the Words, being so very foreign to the Purpose. But I now proceed to the Consideration of his *first Chapter*.

C H A P. II.

An Answer to Mr. H's First Chapter.

MR. H. begins his *first Chapter* with these Words, *It's clear and plain from the whole Current of Scripture, that in all Ages of the Church, whatever Covenant of God any Man was under, his Seed were, together with himself, comprehended in, or under the same Covenant.* And of this he undertakes to give divers Instances.

'Tis readily granted, that in those several Covenants, the natural Seed of the Persons, with whom they were first made, were included in them with their Parents. But then all those Covenants were essentially different from the Covenant of Grace, concerning which the only Question between us lies; so that no cogent Argument can be thence deduc'd to prove that therefore they must be so in this. And this will more evidently appear, by considering the particular Instances produc'd by him.

The first of these is *the Covenant of Works made with Adam before the Fall*. I grant that the whole Race of Mankind were comprehended in this Covenant, as *Adam* was a natural, and Covenant-head, and Representative of all his Posterity in all Ages to the End of the World, otherwise all could not have sinned in him, as *Rom. v. 12, 13*. And on this account the Lord Christ himself is call'd the *last Adam*, *1 Cor. xv. 45*. he alone being a common Head and Representative to all his Seed, which were given him of his Father, as the *first Adam* was to all his natural Posterity. And no considerate Man will pretend, that ever any Person, from the Creation till now, stood related to his Seed as such a Covenant-head, as either of these: which is sufficient to evince that this Instance can be of no force. But I desire it may be well observed that this alone easily leads us to that which directly overthrows his whole Position. For, as God established the Covenant of Works with *Adam*, altho' 'tis

not

not expressly called a Covenant ; so also he revealed the Covenant of Grace to him after the Fall, *Gen. iii. 15.* tho' the Name of a Covenant be not there given it, as all *Interpreters* (so far as I have observed) do own ; and that his natural Seed, as such, were not interested therein with him, I think must necessarily be granted by all, who will not pretend that every Individual of his Posterity are in Covenant with God, and have a Right to Baptism thereby, which I know of none that do. Here then is an Instance that God made a Covenant with the first *Adam* after the Breach of the first Covenant, into which his Posterity, as such, were not received.

His *second* Instance is of the *Covenant* God made with *Noah*, *Gen. vi. 8, 18. & ix. 1, 8, 9.* By God's Covenant with *Noah*, *Chap. vi.* his free Promise to preserve him, and his, from the common Destruction he was about to bring upon the World, seems evidently to be intended, wherein his own Salvation, and that of all God's People was nearly concerned, the promised *Messiah* being not then come ; for he being promised, and imbraced by Faith, as the Seed of the first *Woman*, if her whole Race had been extinct, that first promise, on which the Faith of all the Antediluvian Patriarchs was built, must have fallen to the Ground. And we may observe here, that altho' *Noah* himself had an Interest in the Covenant of Grace, yet one of his Sons had not, *viz. Ham.* As for *Gen. ix. 8, 9.* the Covenant there made with *Noah* is establish'd also with all Mankind, and with every living Creature, to the End of the World, That the Earth and all Creatures therein should be no more destroy'd by a universal Deluge of Waters ; so that *Noah's* remotest Seed in all Generations after, were as much assured of a deliverance from such a Calamity, as his immediate Offspring, by this solemn Declaration of the free and unchangeable Purpose of God's Will ; the Rainbow being then appointed as the Sign and Token of it. And if the Covenant of Grace had been so establish'd with him as this, which is brought to give countenance to the Notion of the Interest of Believers Seed therein, all his Posterity would have been as certainly secured from eternal Perdition, as they are from another universal Flood.

His *third* Instance of the *Covenant* made with *Abraham*, *Gen. xvii. 7.* hath been sufficiently treated of in the *Introduction.*

The

The *fourth* Instance he produces, is the *Covenant made with the whole Tribe of Levi*, for which he cites *Mal. ii. 4, 5, 6. Deut. xviii. 1, 2, 5. Num. iii. 11, 12, 15, 39, 40.* But this, if examined, will be found likewise to weaken the Cause it was brought to defend. For as he cannot but own that 'tis a Mercy and Privilege to receive Ministerial Gifts, and be regularly called to, and imployed in the exercise of them, where the Grace of God inables Persons to be faithful therein; so, that the Sons in those Times came to this Office by Inheritance from their Fathers, as he here pleads is well known. What then is become of one Argument he seems much to rely on in his Discourse, That Christ came not to take away any Privileges his People were possess'd of under the Law? This was a great Privilege granted to all the Males of one Tribe of *Israel*, and that the same is not continued to the Male Seed of Gospel Ministers, is evident. And whereas he afterwards argues, that *It is strange no Account should be left on Record of the Jews making this Objection against the Gospel, That the Infant-seed of the People in Covenant were now deprived of so great a Privilege, if indeed it had been so* 'tis well known that they insisted on the Right of the Seed of *Levi* to minister in the Tabernacle, and officiate for the People in sacred things. How comes it to pass then, that we find not this urged as an Objection against the New Covenant, that its Ministers had not the same Birth-privilege as under the Law? The Answer to one will serve for both. This Covenant with *Levi* contained no Promise of eternal Life to his Seed, and cannot therefore afford any solid Argument to evince that the Covenant conveying eternal Life and Salvation, in a way of free Grace, must extend to the carnal Seed, as that did.

His *fifth* Instance of the *Covenant made with Phinehas* *Numb. xxv. 10, 11, 12, 13.* which is called the *Covenant of everlasting Priesthood*, may be equally improv'd against him, and convince us how little Service his Argument taken from the *Everlastingness* of the Covenant made with *Abraham* *Gen. xvii. 7.* is like to do him, towards proving that to be the Covenant of Grace, which believing Gentiles are now under; since this with *Phinehas* is likewise said to be *everlasting*, which he cannot notwithstanding pretend is the same. And there is good reason to suppose, that in both the Continuance thereof to the end of that Dispensation is intended, as it is also *Gen. xvii. 8.* where the Land of *Canaan*

said to be given for an *everlasting Possession*: And in *Exod.* 15. (where the same is declared of the Sons of *Aaron* in general, as in token of God's approbation of his Zeal, is here solemnly insured to *Phinehas*) the Terms are much the same with those in *Gen.* xvii. 7. In the former place 'tis said, *their anointing shall surely be an everlasting Priesthood throughout their Generations.* And in the latter, the Lord says, *I will establish my Covenant between me and thee, and thy Seed after thee, in their Generations, for an everlasting Covenant.*

A sixth Instance he brings, is of the *Covenant made with David*, 2 *Sam.* vii. 11, to the end, and *Chap.* xxiii. 5. *Zech.* i. 10, 12, &c. To which I reply, that *David* is to be considered in a double Capacity, either first as the Father of his natural Offspring, or secondly in the Capacity of a Believer in Christ. In the former of these, God promised him to give the Kingdom over *Israel* to his Posterity after him; and no rational Man will pretend that this is a Proof, that the Children of Believers, as such, are interested in the Covenant of Grace with their Parents. As to the latter, as he stood in the same Capacity with all other Believers; so there were deplorable Evidences that many of his Children were not interested in the Covenant of Grace with him. *Amnon* committed Incest with his own Sister, and was afterwards slain by *Absolom* (no Intimation of his Repentance being left on Record) in revenge of the Injury done her, and perhaps to remove his elder Brother out of the way, that he might claim the Crown himself, as Heir apparent, by being the eldest of *David's* surviving Sons. And not long after *Absolom* rebels against his Father *David*, commits Incest openly with his Father's Wives, and dies in the very Act of unnatural Rebellion. And they were both greatly lamented by their Father on the account (I doubt not) of their dying in a State of Sin, more than from his natural Affection towards them as his Children. After this *Adonijah* proclaims himself King in his Father's Life-time, without his Knowledge or Consent, and was afterwards suddenly put to death by King *Solomon*, for being found, or at least suspected, to aim at the Kingdom, contrary to God's express Determination, and the known Will of his Father. And to this sorrowful State of his House, I cannot but think he hath relation in 2 *Sam.* xxiii. v. (one of the Texts cited by Mr. H.) *Altho my House be not so with God, yet he hath made with me an everlasting Covenant, &c.* But tho' he might then

44 *An Answer to Mr. H's First Chapter.*

then lament, that neither himself, nor his Sons, had better answered the Character the Spirit of God had before given by him of a just and pious Ruler; I cannot however suppose that when he had Eternity in view, and his Soul was ready to take her Flight into another World, he should chiefly comfort himself with the solemn Assurance that God had given him, of the Kingdom remaining with his Sons; or that of the Fruit of his Body God would raise up the *Messiah*; which, tho' twas a great Privilege, yet, as many of our Saviour's Progenitors never were saved by him, it fell very short of that of having an Interest in the Covenant of Grace in Christ Jesus.

I hope 'twill not be thought improper to make a short Digression here, in order to explain some Passages in Scripture, which may set this matter in a clearer light. *David* then was a *Type* of Christ, both in his Prophetical and Kingly Offices; and hence it is that our Lord, the *Antitype*, is many times in the Old Testament called by the Name of *David*, as *Psal. lxxxix. 20, 27.* and *Isa. lv. 3, 4.* *Jer. xxx. 9.* *Ezek. xxxvii. 24, 25.* it being thro' Christ alone that the Mercies and Blessings of the Covenant are made sure to all the Seed in Covenant; for which reason, I conceive, they are called the sure Mercies of *David*. And this may give some light towards the right understanding of those Texts wherein New Covenant Promises are expressed in such Terms as those were under the Old, as *Isa. lix. 21. & xlv. 3.* For as *David* was a *Type* of Christ, and our Lord is therefore called by his Name; so the carnal Seed in the Old Covenant were Types of the spiritual Seed in the New; and hence the Lord's People, taken out of the Gentile Nations into a Covenant-relation with him, are called by the Names of *Israel* and *Judah*, *Jer. xxxi. 27, 31, &c.* For as the Church was then propagated by a Succession of the carnal Seed of that People under that subservient Covenant; so 'tis now continued by an uninterrupted Series of Believers, whether of their own natural Offspring, or the Children of Unbelievers. For, he being faithful that hath promised, the Promises will be faithfully made good to the Seed intended; and it is too sadly apparent, that the Word of God doth depart out of the Mouths of many of the natural Seed of the most eminent Believers, and that the Spirit of God is not poured out upon their Seed and Offspring, as such. So plain do these things seem to lie in the Holy Scriptures, and are

fully confirmed by daily Observation; that I am perswaded, if Men could wholly lay aside the Influence which Tradition and Custom have over them, they would soon see the Notions which they have thereby been prevailed upon to embrace, wholly inconsistent with the account God's Word and our own Experience gives us, as to the Matters under Debate. And because Mr. *H.* cites afterwards Mr. *Owen* in favour of his Opinion, I shall here transcribe what he says on this Subject, and leave it to them, who have clearer Heads than I, to reconcile it to his own Practice. The Place I shall now cite from him is in his *iii Vol. Heb. Chap. viii. ver. 8.* where speaking of the Persons with whom this Covenant is made, he says, "This House of Israel and of Judah may be considered two ways:

"1. As that People were the whole intire Posterity of Abraham.

"2. As they were *typical*, and mystically significant of the whole Church of God. Hence alone it is that the Promises of Grace under the Old Testament are given unto the Church under those Names, because they were *Types* of them who should really and effectually be made Partakers of them.

And that it may appear what he says under the first is way contradictory to ours, nor in favour of Mr. *H.*'s opinion, I shall transcribe at large what he writes as to that use of the Words.

"In the *first* Sense (says he) God made this Covenant with them, and this on sundry accounts.

"1. Because he, in and through whom alone it was to be establish'd and made effectual, was to be brought forth among them of the Seed of Abraham, as the Apostle plainly declares, *Acts ii. 25.*

"2. Because all things that belong'd to the Ratification of it, were to be transacted among them.

"3. Because, in the outward Dispensation of it, the Terms, and Grace of it, was first in the Counsel of God to be tendred to them.

"4. Because by them, by the Ministry of Men of their Posterity, the Dispensation of it was to be carried unto all Nations, as they were to be blessed in the Seed of Abraham; which was done by the Apostles and other Disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ. So the Law of the Redeemer went forth from Zion. By this means the Co-

"venant

46 *An Answer to Mr. H's First Chapter.*

" *venant was confirmed with many of them, for one Week*
 " *before the Calling of the Gentiles, Dan. ix. 27. And be*
 " *cause these things belonged equally unto them all, men-*
 " *tion is made distinctly of the House of Israel, and the*
 " *House of Judah. For the House of Judah was, at the*
 " *time of the giving of this Promise, in the sole Possession*
 " *of all the Privileges of the Old Covenant; Israel having*
 " *cut off themselves by their Revolt from the House of Da-*
 " *vid, being cast out also for their Sins among the Heathen*
 " *But God, to shew that the Covenant he design'd had no*
 " *respect unto those carnal Privileges which were then in*
 " *the Possession of Judah alone, but only unto the Promise*
 " *made unto Abraham, equals all his Seed with respect un-*
 " *to the Mercy of this Covenant." He then adds,*
 " *In the second Sense, the whole Church of Elect Belie-*
 " *vers is intended under these Denominations, being typi-*
 " *fy'd by them. These are they alone, being one made of*
 " *twain (namely, Jews and Gentiles) with whom the Cove-*
 " *nant is really made and establish'd, and unto whom the*
 " *Grace of it is actually communicated. For all those*
 " *with whom this Covenant is made, shall as really have*
 " *the Law of God written in their Hearts, and their Sins*
 " *pardoned, according unto the Promise of it, as the Peo-*
 " *ple of old were brought into the Land of Canaan, by vir-*
 " *tue of the Covenant made with Abraham: these are the*
 " *true Israel and Judah prevailing with God, and confe-*
 " *ring unto his Name.*
 " *Obs. The Covenant of Grace in Christ is made only*
 " *with the Israel of God, the Church of the Elect. For*
 " *by the making of this Covenant with any, the effectual*
 " *Communication of the Grace of it unto them is princ-*
 " *pally intended. Nor can that Covenant be said to be*
 " *made absolutely with any, but those whose Sins are par-*
 " *doned by virtue thereof, and in whose Hearts the Law of*
 " *God is written, which are the express Promises of it*
 " *And it was with respect to those of this sort among the*
 " *People, that the Covenant was promised to be made with*
 " *them. See Rom. ix. 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33*
 " *Chap. xi. 7. But in respect of the outward Dispensation*
 " *of the Covenant, it is extended beyond the effectual*
 " *Communication of the Grace of it: and in respect ther-*
 " *unto did the Privilege of the carnal Seed of Abraham*
 " *lie.*

And P. 270. speaking of the same thing; he saith, "We have shewed before that the whole *Israel* of God, or the Church of the Elect, is principally intended thereby.

In these Words he owns, that when the carnal Seed are mentioned, as the Persons with whom the Covenant of Grace is made, the spiritual Seed, as *typify'd* by them, are principally intended; and that the Grace of the Covenant is effectually communicated to the spiritual Seed only; and except by *the outward Dispensation of the Covenant a Right to Baptism*, the supposed Seal thereof, be intended by him, there is no Privilege he assigns them, but what we own, as well as our Pedobaptist Brethren, to have belonged to them. But if Mr. H. understood the Distinction that the *Doctor* here makes, he had not the Ingenuity to own it, (tho due Care of Souls obliged to it) lest he might lose the desired Advantage of charging our Opinion with *Unkindness, Uncharitableness, and Cruelty*; and recommending his own to us as *kind and charitable*. And this is what he chiefly makes a Flourish with on all Occasions, to bias this Reader's Judgment in the Examination of this Controversy.

I come now to his *last* Instance, viz. *The Covenant made with all Israel, when they came up out of Egypt, and the Renewal thereof with them, just before their entering into Canaan.* I readily grant that all their Children were taken into the same Covenant with them; altho the Sign thereof by God's appointment was to be affix'd to the Males only. But seeing the New Covenant is declared to be *not according to this*, *Jer. xxxi. 32.* it does not thence follow that all the Children of Believers now have an Interest in this better Covenant, with a Right to Baptism, the supposed Seal thereof. And any one, who impartially reads both Testaments, will easily discern that the same Qualifications were not required under the Old Covenant to intitle to Circumcision and Church-privileges, which are expressly injoin'd as Prerequisites to Baptism, and Communion with the Church under the New. But of this more hereafter.

His Premises being proved wholly unserviceable to the Cause which they were brought to countenance, his Inference can consequently be of no force to the matter in hand.

He proceeds in the next place to demand an Instance, that God ever made a Covenant with any Man, Family, Tribe
or

48 *An Answer to Mr. H's First Chapter.*

or Church, with an Exclusion of their Children from it and its Privileges, until, after grown up, they by their own personal Act reject either the Grace, or Duties of the Covenant.

It has been already granted, that as to most of the Covenantants mentioned by him, they did include not only the Persons themselves, with whom they were at first transacted, but their Posterity also, as well in remote Generations, as those immediately descended from them. However this Concession can be of no advantage to him, unless he will pretend that those, whose immediate Parents are Unbelievers, are in Covenant by virtue of the Faith of their Predecessors some Ages past. But to come more directly to the Question; I have already in a great measure prevented my self of an Answer, by the several Instances before given; as *Adam and Cain, Noah and Ham, Abraham and Ishmael*, whose Exclusion from an Interest in the Covenant, *Gen. 17.* (whatsoever the Nature of it was) is expressly declared *Ver. 18, 19, 20, 21.* of that Chapter, and this before he was circumcised, or his mocking of *Isaac*, the Cause of his Exclusion from *Abraham's* Family some time after, *Chap. 21.* And of *Isaac's* two Son's, *Esau* and *Jacob*, the elder was excluded, as appears from *Rom. ix. 10, 11, 12, 13. Mal. i. 2, 3.* It would be too tedious to insist on the Examples of believing *Gideon*, and his unbelieving and barbarous Son *Abimelech*; and upon *Eli* and his profligate Sons *Hophni* and *Phinehas*; with many others that might be mention'd. We have already spoken of *David* more at large; and many succeeding Kings might be properly brought in, as Instances of Persons in Covenant, whose Children are proved by what is recorded of them, to have fallen short of that Privilege, as not having the *Law of God written in their Hearts*, nor his *Fear placed in their inward Parts*, nor ever having known the Lord, or been preserved from departing from him; which had they had an Interest in the Covenant of Grace, would have been performed towards them. But it is not unlikely he thought to evade the force of all such Instances, by the concluding Words of this Paragraph; *until after grown up, they reject either the Grace, or Duties of the Covenant.* But altho I am willing to be just to him, however he deals with us, and would therefore suppose him to be no *Arminian*; yet these Words are inconsistent with the great Truth of the final Perseverance of God's Covenant-people. And 'tis pity so great a Truth, which hath afforded so much

Com-

Comfort and Support to God's People under various Difficulties and Temptations, should be sacrific'd to such a Purpose. I have already taken notice of the usual Distinction between the *external* and *internal* part of the Covenant, or (as Mr. Blake) the *inward* and *outward* Covenant, and shew'd that there is no ground for such a Distinction in Scripture. And as for the Covenant of Grace, the effectual communication of the Mercies and Privileges of it, is promis'd by that God who cannot lie, to every one who is receiv'd into it. And I could never yet understand what our Brethren intend by the external part of the Covenant, more than a Right to the external Privileges of it; and there are no Privileges that I know of, which they themselves plead to belong to Infants, by virtue of their suppos'd Covenant-interest, and Church-membership, but we allow them as well as they, except Baptism only. The whole then of this Plea, so much rely'd on for Infant Baptism, is no more than this; They have a Right to Baptism, because they have a Right to Baptism, which is plainly *idem per idem*, *It is so, because it is so*, and a downright begging the Point in question.

He adds; *If any are dispos'd to quarrel with this Doctrine, they are already answer'd by the Apostle; to whose Answer therefore I refer them, in Rom. iii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. & xi. 20, 21, 22, 33, 36.*

I hope we are as far from being *dispos'd to quarrel* with the Doctrine deliver'd in the Holy Scriptures, as he can be. And if I should insinuate that he is *dispos'd to quarrel with the Doctrine taught in those Scriptures*, which assert positively the Perseverance of Believers; or the equal Right of God's Covenant People to all the Promises made to them under that Relation; he would undoubtedly account me guilty of *Uncharitableness*, if he gave it no *harder* Name, and that not without Cause. Tho' at the same time I might at least have as much, not to say more, colour for it, as he can pretend for this Suggestion concerning us. But he seems to think the severest Censures good enough, if not too good for us; altho' there is nothing asserted in either of the Places he refers to, but what is as much own'd by us as by him. And I know of no Obligation we are under to take up with his Interpretation of Scriptures, tho' never so groundless.

He now proceeds to assert the Church-membership of Infants, in the following words; *And as the Children are comprehended in the Parents Covenant, so also the Children of God's People, and visible Church, were, together with their Parents, Church-members; and that from the Womb, they were born within the visible Church of God.*

That Children were Church-members under the Law, is own'd; that they were then also admitted to other Church Privileges than he will allow them, shall be afterwards shewn; and if so, what he here asserts, if granted, would make against himself, as well as those he is so displeas'd with. That there was any particular Church-state of Divine Appointment, before the Law was given at Mount Sinai, the Scripture no where affirms, that I know of. That immediately after the Fall Sacrifices were instituted, to lead their Faith to the promis'd Seed, who, by the Sacrifice of himself, was to make real Atonement for Sin, *Abel's Offering* in Faith, and God's Acceptance of it, sufficiently evince. That the holy Patriarchs endeavour'd to maintain the Worship of God in their Families, I don't at all question; as also to instruct their Children in the most necessary Truths, so soon as they were capable of it; in which they ought to be imitated. If this be all he intends, when he says they were *Members of the visible Church before the Law*, p. 9. as I know of no Reason he hath to give them that Name, so it is not worth while to contend about it. But seeing he mentions it, to shew that thus it was *before the Church was National*, and may therefore continue so when the Church is not National; I can't but declare it has been my Perswasion many Years (and for any thing I find in what Mr. H. has said, is likely so to continue) that the Notion of Infants Church-membership is the very Basis, and Foundation of a National Church, and the very Sinews of all Arguments, levell'd against a National Church-state, are cut in sunder by it. But be this as it will; if Infants are Church-members, it must either be of the *invisible*, or *visible Church*. In the former Sense I own some of them are so, as being chosen of God in Christ. But this cannot be intended by him, because he calls it a *wonted Evasion to decline the Evidence of Truth*. Altho' this contains more ground of Support and Comfort to Parents concerning their dying Infants, than the Notion he applauds so much, for being most *charitable* as well as *just*.

In Mr. H's Sense therefore, Children must be suppos'd Members of the *visible* Church, which must be understood either of the Church *Catholic*, or *particular* Congregations. But as to the former of these, some Pedobaptists can see no mention of any such Church in the Holy Scriptures, as Mr. Chauncy in his *Epistle to Dr. Owen's Book*, intitul'd, *The true Nature of a Gospel-Church, and its Government*, p. 5. "The Scripture, says he, speaks of no Church as Catholic visible. The thing it self is but a Chimera of some Mens Brains, it's not in *rerum Natura*, [*in Nature*.] For, if a Catholic visible Church be all the Churches that I see at a time, I am not capable of seeing much more than what can assemble in one Place; and if it be meant of the Churches actually in being, how are they visible to me? Where can they be seen in one Place? I may as well call all the Cities and Corporations in the World, the Catholic visible City, or Corporation, which all Rational Men would call Nonsense. Besides, if all Organiz'd Churches could be got together, it's not Catholic in respect of Saints Militant, much less of Triumphant; for many are no Church-members, that are Christ's Members; and many visible Members are no true Members of Christ Jesus. Where is any such Church capable of Communion in all Ordinances in one Place? And the Scripture speaks of no other Organiz'd visible Church. Again, to a Catholic visible Church constituted, should be a Catholic visible Pastor or Pastors, for as the Church is, such the Pastor and Officers, &c." Thus far Mr. Chauncy. But if Mr. H. intend a particular Church of Christ's Institution, I can see nothing in what he offers for our Conviction, that is likely to answer the End design'd by him.

'Twill not be needful for me to examine particularly his Proofs of Infants Church-membership here alleg'd, having already granted that they were so under the Law, when the Church was National, which is all his Instances amount to. But the Constitution of the Church is now alter'd from National to Congregational, the fleshly Seed who were typically Holy, and Members then, were Types of the spiritual Seed, those living Stones, of which the spiritual House, the Gospel Church, ought to be built, 1 *Pet.* i. 5. And why he should take so much Pains to prove what no one (that I know of) denies, I do not understand; un-

less he hop'd some would be satisfy'd with this, as not considering any difference in the Constitution of the Legal and Evangelical Church-states. And as to those Texts relating to the times of the Gospel, which he hath thrust in among those that concern the *Jewish* Oeconomy, I shall have occasion to speak to them afterwards, where they are particularly insisted on by him.

But it may not be amiss to remark how positively he asserts, that *the Priesthood was the Birth-right of all the First-born Males before, and until the Levitical Law*. The Point in hand does not require me either directly to affirm, or deny this; and it would have look'd more modestly for him not to have affirm'd with so much Confidence, what the greatest Divines have in another manner deliver'd their Thoughts about on both sides. He may, if he pleases, consult Dr. Owen's *Exercit. on the Priesthood of Christ*, prefix'd to his 11 *Vol. on Heb.* p. 156, 157, 158. 'Tis no wonder therefore, that he, who undertakes with so much Assurance to determine as an easy and plain Case, what has been own'd by Men of the highest Acquirements to be attended with great Difficulties, should without ground deliver his Sentiments in this Controversy.

He goes on to tell us, p. 9. That *when Persons that were or should be Fathers, were cast out, or receiv'd into the Covenant and Church, 'twas not as single Persons, but as Heads and Fathers of a Seed and Household*, and cites *Mal. i. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5*. And of the former sort, he mentions the Instances of *Cain, Canaan, Ishmael, Esau, the ten Tribes*, and the *Branches broken off*, *Rom. xi*.

We have particular Reason to take notice of the Instance of *Esau*, as being twice directed to it, in the space of three Lines, for it is that only which is mention'd *Mal. i. 2, 3, &c.* He must therefore look upon it greatly to his Purpose; but with what little Reason, may quickly appear. For *Esau's* Exclusion from the Privileges confer'd on *Jacob*, in pursuance of the Covenant made with *Abraham*, was before he had by his own personal Act rejected the Grace, or Duties of it, as may appear to any one that will duly compare, and consider these Scriptures, *Gen. xxv. 23-26. Mal. i. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Rom. ix. 10, 11, 12, 13.* And therefore *Esau's* Exclusion, as well as his Posterity's, from the Covenant and Church-state, into which *Jacob* and his were receiv'd, was from a free, sovereign Act of God's Will

and the like we observ'd before of *Ishmael*. When he frequently affirms therefore, that *all the Infant-seed of Believers are in Covenant, and Church-members, till by their own personal Act they sin themselves out, and then their Posterity are cast out with them*; this appears to be as inconsistent with Truth, as many other things, whereon he lays great stress in this Discourse. For, as the Persons before mention'd were cast out of that Covenant, before their actual defection from God; so the Children of the unbelieving *Jews*, whose Parents were of profligate Lives, had as much Right to Circumcision, the suppos'd Seal of the Covenant, as such Children whose immediate Parents were Believers. Had not the Offspring of all those that dy'd for their Unbelief and Rebellion in the Wilderness, as much Right to Circumcision, and other Church-privileges, as those of *Joshua* and *Caleb*? Doth not God lay claim to those Children as his, by virtue of the Covenant made with *Abraham* for his natural Offspring, whose Parents were guilty of gross Idolatry, the highest breach of the Covenant, as is plain from *Ezek. xvi. 20, 21.* to which place he directs us, *Pag. 8.* The Words are; *Moreover thou hast taken thy Sons and thy Daughters, whom thou hast born unto me, and these hast thou sacrific'd unto them, to be devour'd. Is this of thy Whoredoms a small matter, that thou hast slain thy Children, and deliver'd them, to cause them to pass thro' the Fire for them?* Did the Parents Faith, and abiding in Covenant with God, give these Children a Covenant interest and claim of Right to it? Had not *Ichabod*, the Son of *Phinehas*, a Monster in Impieties, the same Right and Interest with the Children of the greatest Saints? The Wickedness of *Abaz* did not take away *Hezekiah's* Right; and the like might be said of many more. 'Tis plain therefore, that God's free and unchangeable Purpose, to take that People into a peculiar Covenant with himself, till the great End of their Separation from other Nations, the Production of the *Messiah* among them, according to the Covenant made with *Abraham* and *David*, that he should be rais'd up of their Seed, was that which gave the Children a Right to it, and not the Faith, or Church-membership of immediate Parents.

The Case of *Profelytes* will be afterwards more fully consider'd. But we may here take notice of those Words, where he tells us, that a *Profelyte might not observe the Passover* him-

54 *An Answer to Mr. H's First Chapter.*

himself, (to which our Lord's Supper answers, 1 Cor. v. 7, 8. as their Circumcision is answer'd in our Baptism, Col. ii. 11, 12. Gal. iii. 27, 28.) till all his Males were circumcis'd.

Whether his Meaning be, as his Words seem to import, that all Antipedobaptists should be debar'd the Lord's Supper, I will not determine, till he hath more fully explain'd himself; but 'tis worth our Notice, that both here, and afterwards, he declares the *Lord's Supper to succeed the Passover, as Baptism Circumcision*; which greatly weakens the Foundation of his whole Discourse. For, he cannot deny but the Passover was as great a Privilege as Circumcision, and the Lord's Supper as Baptism; and if he had such Proof, that Infants have a Right to Baptism now, as may be produc'd of their having been then admitted to the Passover, a great deal more might be said as to the warrantableness of that Practice. For all Families were to eat the Passover, with this only Qualification declar'd as necessary, that the Males were all circumcis'd; so soon as that was perform'd, they might therefore be admitted. And may we not justly expostulate with him in his own Words? *Will you be so unkind and uncharitable a Parent to deny the Lord's Supper to your Infants, when they were not of old deny'd the Passover? For, if they had been excluded, they would, no doubt, have been express'd so to be, p. 197. Whatever Alteration the Lord hath made in his Institutions and Ordinances since Christ's coming, and Suffering, from what they were before, it is certain, (1) That such Alterations are always for the enlarging the Privileges of the People of God in such Ordinances; but never for the taking away, or lessening any Privilege in any Ordinance that the People of God, as such, did enjoy before Christ's coming. (2) Such Alterations are plainly reveal'd in the New Testament. But to keep the Infants of Believers from the Lord's Supper, a new Sign and Token [the Pedobaptists call this a Seal, as well as Baptism,] of the everlasting Covenant, is to straiten, and cut short the Privilege of the People of God, and we find no such Alteration reveal'd in the New Testament, p. 90.* The heat of his Zeal put him upon urging these things with Vehemency against us, without considering that they were directed as much against his own Practice as ours. Whatever Arguments therefore he can bring against those who should thus reason with him for the Admission of Infants to the Lord's Supper, may with equal Force be turn'd upon himself. And there are

as early Testimonies in Antiquity of Infants being admitted to the Lord's Supper as to Baptism, they being, as *Maldonate* says, administred together for 600 Years.

But 'tis probable he may think to put by all this with the poor Evasion he uses, p. 113. where he makes the *Objection* against himself: *We can't see, say some, how Infants can be capable of Baptism, and yet not capable of the Lord's Supper.* To which he contents himself with this Answer: *I am sorry for it, and wish you better Eye-sight, and (in order thereto) to lay by Prejudice; and then endeavour (for 'tis attainable) to conceive, how an Infant of a Month old is capable of being carried a Mile or two in the Arms of another, and yet not capable of walking so far on foot alone. In Baptism the Person baptiz'd is passive, (or at least ought so to be) the Work lies on the Baptizer alone; but in the Lord's Supper divers Actions are required of the Receivers, as, to take, to eat, to drink, to do it in remembrance of Christ, to shew forth the Lord's Death. When he says, in Baptism the Person baptized is always passive, or ought to be so, he will scarce ever perswade any thinking Person that John carried our Saviour into Jordan, or the rest of those he baptized. Besides, 'tis expressly said, that the Eunuch went down into the Water, and came up again out of it with Philip, Acts viii. 38, 39. And that the Qualifications necessary to Baptism are as great, as those required to render a Person meet for the Lord's Supper, appears both from the Commission, Mat. xxviii. 19. Mark xvi. 15, 16. and the Administration of it by the primitive Ministers: so Philip, Acts viii. 37. If thou believest with all thine Heart thou mayest, &c., it is lawful. If he say, these Qualifications were necessary to render those meet Subjects of Baptism, who were converted when Adult (which is the usual Plea) may not another as well say, the Duties mentioned, as required of them that are admitted to the Lord's Supper, concern the Adult only? But that no other Qualifications were required to intitle to the Passover, than to Circumcision, except only their being first circumcised, cannot, I think, be well deny'd. And whereas he here says, the Lord's Supper answers to the Passover, as Baptism to Circumcision, what colour of Reason can be urged, why the Subjects of the one should not be admitted to the other? especially since all the 3000 admitted to Baptism and Membership in the Gospel Church, were also admitted to the*

56 *An Answer to Mr. H's First Chapter.*

Lord's Supper, *Acts* ii. 41, 42. If Baptism was then administered to the same Subjects as Circumcision was before, many of their Children would have been baptized the same Day with their Parents; for so were all *Abraham's* Males, young as well as old, circumcised the same Day with himself, *Gen.* xvii. 26, 27. And tho' some of these came from remote Parts, yet no doubt many of them were Inhabitants of *Jerusalem*, and near their Habitations, and so had Opportunity to bring their Children to be baptized, as well as offer themselves to partake of it. But that no more were then baptiz'd, than were admitted to the Lord's Supper, is expressly declared, *ver.* 42. where, of those mentioned *ver.* 41. to be baptized, it is asserted, that *they continued stedfastly in the Apostle's Doctrine and Fellowship, and in breaking of Bread, and in Prayers.* Moreover if Baptism and the Lord's Supper be both *Seals* of the Covenant, and Children by being interested in the Covenant have a Right to one of these *Seals*, why not as well to the other? Have they but half an Interest therein, that they must receive but half a Ratification of it? Doth the Word of God any more direct to give them one Seal than the other? And are they not as capable of discerning the *Lord's Body*, and examining themselves, as of making a Profession of their Faith, and bringing forth Fruits meet for Repentance? If in the one it be said, these things are required only of the Adult, why not in the other also? As to the Actions of *taking and eating*, a Child while very young is capable to receive and eat so small a Quantity as is usually given on that Occasion; and may be well supposed as able to exert Acts of Faith and Love in that Ordinance, as in Baptism: And, that Grace should be in exercise in one Ordinance, as well as in the other, by those that are adult, our Brethren will not deny. It may possibly by this time be discovered by an impartial Reader, for what reason *Mr. H.* indeavoured to put by the Force of this *Objection*, with very little more than an unbecoming Scorn. Some Men, it seems, think it the best Policy to slight that which they cannot answer, and use only Shift and Evasion instead of solid arguing, when their Cause will not furnish them with better Materials. But by reading what he says, *p.* 98. That in *Gen.* xvii. and *Exod.* xii. the Lord granted as a Privilege, and commanded as a Duty the Application of the Token of the Covenant to the Infant-seed of Believers, and never revok'd that Grant and Command, tho'

he

hath changed the outward Sign from Circumcision to Baptism: and p. 104. The Lord's Supper is come in the room and place of the Passover; and it's both lawful and profitable to reason from the old Sacraments to the new: By reading these Passages, I say, one would think, that he was for the Admission of Children to one Sacrament as well as the other, unless he mistook *Exod. xii.* for *Lev. xii.* But if that be so, what I writ, p. 104. must not have been duly considered, since he will be still obliged to allow their Admission to both the proposed Seals, which he afterwards opposes in p. 113. unless he will deny that Infants were admitted to the Passover, which would look with no favourable Aspect on the Cause he pleads.

But to return from this Digression, he adds, p. 10. To say that Infants are in the Covenant of Grace by their Parents Faith, and then say (as many do) they are incapable of Faith, and so of entering into Covenant in their own Persons, is to exclude 'em from the Covenant of Grace, and from the Means of entering into it; and so consequently from Salvation, unless they can find out some new and unscriptural way of entering into Covenant, or of being saved out of Covenant.

That Parents Faith brings their Children into the Covenant of Grace, and that they are capable in an ordinary way of the exercise of Faith (which is an Act of the Understanding, as well as of other Faculties of the Soul) may be deny'd, without intailing on our Perswasion any such dark Consequences as he here suggests. That none can be saved, but those whom God is pleased mercifully to receive into the Covenant of Grace, is granted; but that the Infants of Believers, as such, are so received, is deny'd, and the contrary, as to divers of them, too sadly demonstrable. That renewing Work is wrought upon all who are saved, and that 'tis necessary for Children, as well as grown Persons, to make them meet for the Inheritance of the Saints in Light, is plain from the Words of our Saviour, *John iii. 6.* where, to discover the Necessity of Regeneration to all, he says, *that which is born of the Flesh is Flesh*; more particularly directing our Thoughts to our original Defilement, than the woful Fruits it brings forth in the Life. And that in Regeneration Principles, Seeds, or Habits of every Grace are infused into the Soul, I likewise own; but that it is not so with the Children of Believers in general, who arrive at such Years as to be capable to discover Habits by the Acts that

How

58 *An Answer to Mr. H's First Chapter.*

flow from them, 'tis plain. Moreover we may here observe that Mr. H's Notion, as it promises *Life to all Believers Children, that sin not themselves out of the Covenant*; it leaves under the dreadful Sentence of Condemnation the Offspring of Unbelievers, who die in Infancy, before the Commission of any actual Sin; which seems too hard and severe. And that many of the Offspring of Unbelievers belong to the Election of Grace, the effectual Calling of divers of them, when grown up to Years of Understanding, fully evinces. And to make it more evident how unreasonable and groundless his great Outcry against us for *Charitableness* is, I shall here once for all deliver somewhat of my Opinion concerning such who die before they come to Years of Understanding; whereby it may appear which of us exercises the greater *Charity* for them. But that it may not be supposed what I am going to say are new and sudden Thoughts, I shall deliver only what I had occasionally written on this Argument several Years ago, viz.

If it be said, That since we own that all Persons are born in Original Sin, and yet deny Baptism to our Children we can have no ground to believe that those dying in Infancy can be saved; I answer, *Secret things belong to God, but things that are revealed belong to us, and to our Children, and Posterity, Deut. xxix. 29.* And I know of no Profit that will like to issue upon an over curious Enquiry after the Method of God's dealing with such; but we are to leave that to the Sovereign Disposal of him, who we are assured can do not but do right, and who is full of Compassion and tender Mercies; it being out of our power to fit them for Glory or render them accepted with God by any Act of ours towards them, uncommanded by him. The Method of God's dealing with those whom he saves, as revealed in Holy Scripture, concerns such who are capable to understand that Revelation. And so far as any Duty is incumbent on them towards their Children, it is therein also fully expressed for their Information. But God may have Ways secret to us, to save those who die before they come to Years of Understanding. We know that God foreknew and foreappointed who should die in Infancy; and I am comfortably perswaded, and I think not without ground from Scripture, that he did also foreappoint to receive Satisfaction for their Sins in the Death of Christ, and by renewing of their Natures to prepare them for Glory.

ave often thought of the Carriage and Words of holy David concerning his Child, who died at 7 Days old (and therefore before he had any Warrant to circumcise it) which we have recorded, 2 Sam. xii. 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23. where we are informed, that altho' with Fasting and Tears he besought the Lord to spare it, while it was yet alive; yet his Sorrow for it, so far as appears, ended with its Life. He that so long, and so sorely mourned for Amnon and Absalom after their Death, who had lived to commit actual Rebellion against the Lord; yet did not so for this Child, who died in Infancy. And this makes me conclude, that when he said, ver. 23. *I shall go to him*, he doth not only intend to the Grave, but also to the Fruition of Joy with it in Paradise, where to share the same Glory with it for ever. To which I should add, Mat. xix. 14. *But Jesus said, suffer little Children, and forbid them not to come unto me, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*; our Brethren, who look upon them to have been young Children, and not only like such in Humility, Meekness and other Virtues, would not here oppose me. He says not, the little Children of Believers, neither is there any Account left us whether the Parents of those Children were Believers or not: But he asserts, that *such is the Kingdom of Heaven, i.e. the Kingdom of glory above*. And therefore tho' Adam being a public Head and Representative of all his Posterity, in the Covenant transacted with him, I make no question but God might, if he had so pleased, upon his Fall, have very justly left him and all his Posterity under the dreadful Sentence of condemnation, without providing a Remedy for them; yet since he has vouchsafed to give a Seed to Christ to Redeem and Save, there is nothing in his revealed Will to obstruct our charitable Thoughts, that all who die in Infancy, before the Commission of actual Sin, are of that happy number.

His next Attempt is to prove, from the proper Names which the Godly gave to many of their Children, that their Children were of the number of God's People, within his Covenant, Church and Kingdom. To deny this (he saith) is in effect to say, the holy Fathers did mock and deceive their Children in imposing on them Names that signified the choicest spiritual Blessings. And of such significative Names he gives us divers instances. But this shews how positively some Men will adventure to assert any thing upon a mere uncertain Conjecture at best; and be very liberal in their Reflections upon those

those who cannot allow their Dictates for good Proof. Good *Expositors* have assign'd other Reasons why the People of God called their Children by such Names; but Mr. H. would perswade us he so certainly knows the Reason, that they who remain of a different Opinion are very injurious to these pious and good Men. Tho' how he came to be thus well assured in so doubtful a Case, I can't pretend to know, and must take the liberty to question it, till I find better evidence for it. As to several of these Names, the Spirit of God hath acquainted us with the Reason and Occasion of them; some whereof were commemorative of signal Mercies received, others prophetical, and divers of them occasioned by remarkable Occurrences a little before or at the time of their Birth. And for these he mentions they seem designed either to testify the Parents Interest in Faith in the everlasting and sure Covenant of Grace; or to express their Desires, Wishes and Prayers for their Children, and thereby to instruct them what was most needful for them to seek after. Nor can I easily imagine, that they intended thereby to perswade their Children to believe their own personal Interest in the Covenant of Grace from the Birth, or before they partook of Faith and Regeneration, which might have been a Means to lead them into a fatal Mistake in Matters of the highest moment. Is there the least Intimation, where the Reason of the Names of any are assigned, that they were given them for such an End. We know indeed that some Names were given by immediate Direction from God, who knew who were his; and therefore 'tis no ways absurd to suppose that these (at least some of them) might have such a Designation, especially in those Ages when extraordinary Prophets were frequently raised up of God among his People. But this is very different from the Case of Persons giving Names to their Children without any such Divine Command, which is what we are here speaking of. For as these were arbitrary, so we find that the Conduct of the Children did not always correspond with the Signification of their Names. Thus *Eve* was moved to name her first-born Child from a groundless Imagination that she had then brought forth the *Messiah*, the promised Seed, who was to break the Serpent's Head; hence she called his Name *Cain*, that is, *Possession*, and assigns this Reason, *I have gotten a Man the Lord*, (as the Words properly signify) q. d. *God-man*, the *Emanuel*: Whereas the

Good Woman, to her great Grief, found her self afterwards most sadly mistaken.

Mr. H's II. Chapter containing only a Table of Scriptures, suggested under such Heads as might seem to make the fairest view of proving, that *Believers Children, as such, always are, and still continue in the Lord's Covenant and Church-members*; to enter into a particular Examination of them there would be too tedious, and run out my Discourse beyond its designed Length. I shall therefore pass them by, and proceed to the consideration of his III. Chapter; which I am likewise the rather inclined to do, because such of them which have any relation to the Controversy, either have, or will more conveniently fall in my way elsewhere.

C H A P. III.

An Answer to Mr. H's Third Chapter.

MR. H's III. Chapter begins with this Objection, which he frames against himself: *We are now since Christ's coming under the New Covenant, the Old Covenant is vanished away, &c.* Heb. viii. 13. To which he answers, *This hurts not our Infants in the least, because they are together with their Parents in the New Covenant, as administered since Christ's coming, as much every way as Infants were in Covenant with their Parents before.* And for the proof of this Assertion, he cites *Isa. xlix. 22, 25. lxxv. 23. lxxvi. 2. and lxi. 8, 9. Jer. xxx. 9, 20. with Gal. iv. 28. Jer. xxxi. 34. xxxii. 38, 39, 40. Ezek. xxxvii. 24, 25, 26, 27, 28. and Acts ii. 39.*

If he thinks that Believers Infants are as much interested in the Covenant of Grace now as they were in the Sinai Covenant, the first Lines of which were drawn in the Covenant transacted with *Abraham, Gen. xvii. 7, 8, 9, &c.* can't agree with him. For then all the Children of believing, or unbelieving *Jews*, had as much Interest in the Blessings which any received by virtue of that Covenant, as their Parents. And he cannot himself suppose that Believers Infants are as much interested in the Covenant of Grace

as

as their Parents, unless he will say, the final Perseverance of the Parents is not secured by the Promises of the Covenant; or, that the Perseverance of the Children is secured as well as theirs; and it may not be amiss for him to take some time to consider of it, before he assert either. But if he means, they are *as much every way since Christ's coming* in the Covenant of Grace, as the Children of the Jews were in the same Covenant of Grace under the Law, this will do him no service; it having been already demonstrated by divers Instances, to which many more might be added, that the Children of Believers, as such, *before Christ's coming*, were not interested in the Covenant of Grace, and it finally appears that they are not so now.

None of the Texts he produces mention one Word of the Infants of Believers, as such; and those who will be at the pains to consider the coherence of them with the Place whence they are taken, will perceive they are far from answering his Design. I shall proceed to give a brief Account of them in the order he has cited them.

Isa. xlix. 22, 25. speaks of the *Sons, Daughters, and Children*, which should be brought into the Church of Christ by the *Gentiles*, i. e. which should be *begotten again to a lively Hope*, as the Apostle's Phrase is, *1 Pet. i. 3.* by the Blessing of Christ on the Ministry which he would raise up among the *Gentiles*, as typify'd by the Deliverance granted to the Jewish Church from the *Babylonish Captivity*, wherein by the over-ruling Providence of God the *Gentiles* were very helpful to them.

Isa. lxxv. 23. gives a Reason of the temporal Blessings which the Lord would grant to the godly Jews and their Posterity, as *inhabiting the Houses built by them, and eating of the Fruit of the Vineyards which they should plant*, ver. 21. Duration and Perpetuity being likewise promised to them in this their happy Estate, ver. 22. And none, that I know of, ever yet question'd God's bestowing temporal Blessings on the Faithful among the Jews, and their Offspring, who walked in their Steps, for their sakes. And that this Promise is made only to such, appears by *Ezek. xviii.* from the 1. to the 21. and is likewise applicable to *Gentile Believers* and their Posterity; but what this makes to his purpose, seems very difficult to apprehend.

Isa. lxvi. 22. Mr. Pool's *Annotations* very well expound in these Words: "This whole Verse is only a Promise
" of

An Answer to Mr. H's Third Chapter. 63

of the Perpetuity of the Gospel Church, and the not failing of Additions to it, of such as shall be saved, till the World shall have an End. As the new State of the Church, to be raised up under the *Messiah*, shall abide, so there shall be a daily Succession of true Believers for the upholding of it; for if Believers could fail from the Earth, the Church, made up of them only, as the true Members of it, must fail also.

Isa. lxi. 8, 9. promiseth that the true Church, which was before almost wholly confin'd to the *Jews*, should have a seed and Offspring among the *Gentiles*, which should have such visible Characters of God's Love to them, and Grace in them, as would be conspicuous to all Beholders.

As to *Jer. xxx. 9, 20.* which he joins with *Gal. iv. 28.* the grossest Error may be countenanced, if two Passages of the Prophets, no more nearly connected than these, be interpreted constantly to relate to the same thing. That transitions are sometimes made, in the compass of a few verses, from pure Evangelical Promises, to those that peculiarly relate to that old subservient Covenant, and typical Church, and at other times the contrary, is manifest. And at this *ver. 20.* speaks of the happy Estate of the Posterity of the *Jews* in the Land of *Canaan*, after their Return from *Babylon*, the *Annotations* just before mentioned shew, explaining those Words, *Their Children shall be as aforetime, us*; "Their Posterity also shall be as happy, and in as much repute, as they were before this carrying into *Babylon*." This therefore being the plain Meaning of the Place, can afford no Advantage to Mr. *H's* Cause. And *Gal. iv. 28.* is so far from being of any Service to it, that it helps to weaken it. For the Apostle there tells the believing *Galatians*; *Now we, Brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of Promise.* To clear up the Meaning of which expression, 'twill be proper to explain some few Verses which precede it. In *ver. 22, 23.* he had said, *For it is written, that Abraham had two Sons, the one by a Bond-maid, the other by a Free-woman. But he who was of the Bond-maid was born after the Flesh (i. e. according to the Power of Nature) but he of the Free-woman was by Promise; i. e. by a supernatural Operation of God in accomplishment of the promise made to Abraham.* And after declaring, *ver. 24, 25, 26.* that *Agar* and *Sarah* were Types of the two Covenants, *Agar* of that transacted with the fleshly Seed at Mount

64 *An Answer to Mr. H's Third Chapter.*

Mount Sinai, *Sarah* of that made with the spiritual Seed only, he tells them in this 28 Verse; *We Brethren* (i. e. Believers, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*) as *Isaac* was are the Children of Promise; that is, born again by the supernatural Power of the Spirit of God, in fulfilling the Promises made to Christ the Mediator, concerning the Seed given of the Father to him, and Heirs of all the Good spiritual and eternal, promised to the spiritual Seed of *Abraham*. And I cannot but think it very strange, that this Text, which so plainly contradicts his Opinion, should be summon'd by him to speak in its Favour. For, if *Isaac*, the natural Son of believing *Abraham*, as well as *Isaac*, was not interested in the Covenant made with him as *Isaac* was, all the natural Seed of believing *Gentiles*, whose Parents derive their own Claim to New Covenant Blessings from their Relation to *Abraham*, as his Seed, cannot rationally be thought to be privileg'd above the immediate Offspring of the Father of the Faithful himself.

Fer. xxxi. 1, 34. is the next place alleg'd. But the Reason of his connecting the 34 Ver. with the 1. is not easily to be understood; unless he design'd thereby to persuade that one and the same Covenant is treated of in both. Tho' to attempt the doing this, by only directing us to the Verses contain'd in the same Chapter, as if we must necessarily believe, that because the New Covenant is intended in *Ver.* 34. it must therefore be so in the other, will hardly persuade any thinking Person to his Opinion. And there is very little reason to suppose that, *At the same time*, *Ver.* 1. and *After those Days*, *Ver.* 33. relate to the same time, and the same Covenant; the former plainly referring to the time of the *Jews* return from the *Babylonish* Captivity, when God own'd all the Families of *Israel* to be his, by his favourable Providence towards them; and the other to the Establishment of the New Covenant, or Testament, after the Incarnation of Christ, by the Death of the Testator.

As to *Fer.* xxxii. 38, 39, 40. it has been spoke to before in the *Introduction*, to which I refer the Reader. And if *their Children* it should be suppos'd their natural Seed was intended, as he would have it, 'tis own'd, that the Parents fearing God tends to the good of their Children, altho' they are not by that means brought within the safe and happy Bond of the New Covenant of Grace.

Ezek. xxxvii. 24, 25, 26, 27, 28. either contains a Promise made to the natural Seed of *Abraham*, of their re-possessing the Land of *Canaan*, they and their Posterity after them; or the spiritual Seed, as the *Antitype* of the carnal, were intended, and the spiritual and eternal Blessings promised them are held forth under the *Type* of *Canaan*, and external Peace and Happiness therein. Which way soever we take it, this place affords no Countenance to his Opinion; the natural Seed of Believers, as such, being neither the natural nor spiritual Seed of *Abraham*.

Acts ii. 39. will be afterwards consider'd in *Chap. vii.* I have taken the Pains briefly to examine the *Texts* here cited by him, which he singles out, as those which seem to speak the fullest to his Purpose; and are therefore, most of them, frequently cited in his *Tables* of Scriptures. But these having been shewn to be foreign to the Design for which they were produc'd, the Reader may easily judge of the Pertinence of the rest, which he thought not well worth his while to transcribe in Words at length.

In the next place he acquaints us, that *when we read of the Old and New Covenant, we are not to think, that by the first meant the Books written before Christ's coming; and by the latter, the Books written since.*

The *Books written before Christ's coming* are by the Spirit of God stil'd the *Old Testament*, *2 Cor. iii.* 14. And that the *Books written since* are called by the Name of the *New Testament*, the Title prefix'd to them, as well in the *Original*, as *Translations*, both in *English* and other Languages, sufficiently testifies; and that the terms *Covenant* and *Testament* are both us'd to express the same thing, is no less evident, *Heb. viii. & ix.* In the same Sense therefore that the *Books written before*, and since the coming of Christ, are call'd the *Old* and *New Testament*, they may likewise, without Absurdity, be conceiv'd of as the *Old* and *New Covenant*; as the former more fully reveal the *Old Covenant*, and the latter the *New*; and as the positive Duties enjoin'd under the *Old Covenant*, are deliver'd in those *Books*; and the Ordinances depending on positive Institution under the *New Covenant*, in these. That *Baptism* is such an Ordinance as solely depends on Institution, is granted by all; the *Washings* enjoin'd in the *Old Testament* being now abolish'd among the rest of the *Legal Ceremonies*, and the *Gospel-ordinance of Baptism* only appointed in the

66 *An Answer to Mr. H's Third Chapter.*

New. From hence therefore we are to take our Directions touching the Subjects of it, and the manner of its Administration; and have no more Warrant to govern ourselves by the Old Testament, in relation to Ordinances, than Officers. I presume Mr. *H.* will not grant, that the Appointment of a *Pontifex Maximus*, or *High Priest*, under the Old Testament, is sufficient to authorize the setting up of a *Pontifex Maximus*, or *Pope*, under the New. But yet I readily own, that God made gracious Discoveries of New Covenant Mercies in the Old Testament, altho' in a more obscure manner than in the New; on which account that Ministration is said to have *no Glory*, in comparison of the excelling Glory of this, 2 Cor. iii. 9, 10. That the *Books of the Old Testament are not abolished by Christ*, I readily acknowledge; altho' I deny that God has by the Institutions therein contain'd, given us Warrant and Direction to what Subjects Gospel-ordinances are to be administer'd. The *things which are shaken and removed*, Heb. xii. 27. were the Old Covenant made with the carnal Seed, and the Church-state founded thereon; *typical Persons* and things were to give Place to their *Antitypes*; there was a total removal and abolition of them from their former Station. On the contrary, the *things that could not be shaken*, were the New Covenant, fill'd up with all Ordinances of Worship suited to it, with the Church-state founded thereon, which was *never to be changed*, or alter'd. And this may also help to explain 2 Cor. iii. 11.

I as freely acknowledge, as he can desire, that *God's Covenant with Abraham, and his Spiritual Seed, was not shaken, or remov'd*; but cannot own, that *all the Children of Believers* are of that Number. And except he could prove this (which is so directly contrary to the Holy Scriptures) all his Plea, that *the Covenant with Abraham and his Seed remaineth*, comes to nothing. We need not therefore long insist upon the *ten Arguments* by which he indeavours to prove, that *the Covenant with Abraham and his Seed, is the Covenant of Grace, and not to be remov'd*. However, I shall briefly consider them. But since he cites here *Gen. xii. 3. & xvii. 7, &c.* as if but one and the same Covenant was intended in both places; I desire the Reader will take notice of what has been said already, especially in the *Introduction*, p. 23, &c. concerning the two Covenants made with *Abraham* for a twofold Seed; which Distinction will

very

very much help him to obviate the Force of Mr. H's Arguments, in which he represents them but as one.

As to the *first* Argument of its being called an *Everlasting Covenant*; that the Covenant with the carnal Seed is so call'd in one respect, and that with the spiritual in another, is already demonstrated, and needs not be here again repeated. That the Infants of Believers, as such, are neither the one, nor the other of these Seeds, has also been prov'd.

The *second* is own'd, viz. That God made with Abraham a Covenant founded on pure Grace; and the *third* thus far; That this Covenant establish'd with him, is confirm'd by the Oath of God, and Death of Christ. But what ground he had to assert, that this Covenant run from Parents to Children, if he mean from ordinary believing Parents to their Children, I leave him to shew at his leisure; nothing like a Proof being yet produc'd by him.

The *fourth* might as well have been contain'd in the preceding; for it seems needless after he had told us 'twas confirm'd by the Death of Christ, to bring this for a new Argument, that it was confirm'd by his Blood.

His *fifth* is, That the Covenant, Gen. xvii. 7, &c. is the Covenant of Grace, because those Words, And to thy Seed, are apply'd to Christ mystical, Gal. iii. 14, 16. This place in Galatians will afterwards be consider'd in the next Chapter, tho' if 'twas granted, it would not answer his End; for he can't but know, that all the Infants of Believers belong not to the mystical Body of Christ; because if they did, he, their Head, would suffer none of them to perish.

To his *sixth*, where he undertakes to prove the Covenant God made with Abraham, to be the Covenant of Grace, or New Covenant; because Circumcision, the Token and Seal of it, was both a Sign of the Circumcision of the Heart, and a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith; I answer, (1.) That Circumcision belong'd to the Sinai Covenant, as a Sign and Token of it; which, upon his own Principles, he cannot deny; and that the Sinai Covenant was not the same in Substance with the Covenant of Grace, or New Covenant, hath been already shewn in the Introduction, p. 9. &c. Tho' if Circumcision in the Flesh, being a Sign of the Circumcision of the Heart, proves the Covenant with Abraham to be the Covenant of Grace, it must also prove the Sinai Covenant so to be; but as it don't prove

the latter, so neither can it the former. But (2.) this, instead of answering his Intention, shews (if I mistake not) that the Covenant made with *Abraham*, Gen. xvii, 7, 8, &c. whereof Circumcision was a Sign, was not the Covenant of Grace, the same in Kind that believing *Gentiles* are now under. For, it is not probable that one and the same Sign should be affix'd to two distinct Covenants of different Natures; and its being, by the Command of God, affix'd to the carnal Seed, who we know were not, as such, interested in the Covenant of Grace; and that Covenant promising eternal Life only upon perfect Personal Obedience; we may reasonably conclude 'twas not the same with the Covenant of Grace; before made with him, Gen. xii. 3. and afterwards confirm'd to him, Chap. xxii. As to Rom. iv. 11. it has been already consider'd, p. 19, &c. and manifested to speak nothing to his Purpose. And whereas he argues, that *Circumcision was a Sign and Seal of two of the great Blessings of the Covenant of Grace*, he cannot be ignorant that there were several Duties injoin'd, besides Circumcision, in the *Sinai* Covenant, that were Signs of great Blessings of the New Covenant, which will not evince that Covenant to be the Covenant of Grace, but only subservient to it.

As for his seventh Argument, 'tis acknowledg'd that the Covenant of Grace with *Abraham* is preached in the New Testament to both Jews and Gentiles; but that the Covenant made with him for his natural Seed is this Covenant of Grace, wants Proof.

His eighth is, That the Blessings promised in this Covenant do evince it to be the Covenant of Grace, or New Covenant. And of these he mentions five. (1.) The sending of Christ into the World. (2.) The Promise of the sanctifying Spirit, and Sanctification by him. (3.) The Pardon of Sin. (4.) The Promise of the Resurrection and Eternal Life. (5.) Heaven it self under the Type of Canaan. But to this I answer, (1.) That the Covenant of Grace, which God made with *Abraham*, promiseth all these Blessings to all the Seed in the Covenant, I readily grant. (2.) That these Promises are not fulfill'd to all the Offspring of Believers, both Scripture and Experience testify, and he cannot well be ignorant of it. This is therefore sufficient Proof against what he contends for, but none for him. (3.) He has not yet prov'd, and I perswade my self cannot, that the Co-

venant

venant made with *Abraham*, *Gen. xvii. 7. &c.* is this Covenant of Grace, which promiseth all these New Covenant Blessings. (4.) If it was, ordinary Believers not standing in the same Capacity with *Abraham*, and their natural Seed, as such, being not his Seed in the Sense of the Scripture, they cannot be proved from hence to be interested in this Covenant. Are all the Offspring of Believers pardon'd, sanctify'd and saved? If not, how can he imagine, that his informing us that the Faithful God hath in the sure Covenant of Grace promised all these Blessings to all the Seed in Covenant, can countenance the Cause for which he thus appears an Advocate?

Before he proceeds to his *ninth* Argument, he starts an *Objection* against what he had last said, *viz. The Covenant of God with Abraham can't be the Covenant of Grace, because the Land of Canaan was promised in that Covenant to Abraham and to his Seed for a Possession, &c.* That the Covenant wherein the Land of *Canaan* is promised for a Possession to all received into it, is not the same Covenant that believing *Gentiles* have an Interest in, must (I think) be acknowledged by any one who will not assert their Right to the literal *Canaan*; or greatly derogate from the Righteousness and Faithfulness of God, in owning that what he hath promised is not perform'd; or without colour of Truth, or Reason, affirm that the literal *Canaan* was not promised to *Abraham* and his Seed, with whom that Covenant was made; any one of which I perswade my self *Mr. H.* will not say.

I must now consider the Answer he gives to this *Objection*, which is directed against the Notion of its being the *Covenant of Works*. But, if any one should assert it was a Covenant of a mixt Nature, partly of Grace, and partly of Works; his Reasons to disprove its being a Covenant of Works will not convince such an one, that what he offers, (if allowed for good proof) does well suit his Design. And thus far it is my own Sentiment, that there was *Grace* in the Covenant made with him for his carnal Seed, in that by it they enjoy'd Means of Instruction of their need of Christ, and the Satisfaction made by him; altho' that Covenant promises Life eternal only by perfect Obedience, and may thence be justly denominated a *Covenant of Works*. But let us hear his *Reasons* why it was not the *Covenant of Works*.

70 *An Answer to Mr. H's Third Chapter.*

1. *The Promise was not to Abraham or his Seed thro' the Law, Rom. iv. 13.* This depends upon a groundless Supposition, that the Promise there intended by the Apostle is the Promise of *Canaan*, which will not be so soon proved as affirm'd. And if it be allowed him, that the Land of *Canaan* is meant by the *World* in this place, as he explains it in the following Page, 'twill give no countenance to his Cause. For it is readily granted, that literal *Canaan* was not given to *Abraham* and his Seed thro' the Law, i. e. because *Abraham* had by his good Works merited it at God's hand. However it doth not thence follow, but that God, when he had by an Act of sovereign Grace chosen *Abraham* and his Seed to be a peculiar People to himself, might establish a Covenant, first with him for them, and afterwards with them at Mount *Sinai*; which by promising Life only upon perfect Obedience, might convince that a perfect Righteousness was necessary, that they were utterly unable to work out such a Righteousness, and thereby shew them the Necessity of seeking for it in another, even in *Christ Jesus*; and the Sacrifices they were daily to offer up, were to direct their Faith to the great Sacrifice, by which Atonement was to be made. That by the Law in this, and other places in the New Testament, the Mount *Sinai* Covenant is intended, may appear to any one who compares one Passage in the *Epistles* with another; and that Circumcision was affix'd to all those in that Covenant, as a Sign and Token of it, is undeniable. This therefore rather proves the Covenant of Circumcision to be a *Covenant of Works*, than the contrary; seeing the *Sinai* Covenant promised Life eternal upon no other Condition than perfect Obedience.

2. *Abraham was long before made free from the Covenant of Works, and justify'd by Grace.* That he was before, by Faith in *Christ*, the promised Seed, made free from the Curse pronounced against all Transgressors in that Covenant, is granted; but that God did not afterwards establish with him a mix'd Covenant for his carnal Seed, in suberviency to the Covenant of Grace, wherein the Land of *Canaan*, to serve the Ends of that Covenant, was promised them for a Possession, has not yet been proved.

3. *The Condition of the Covenant of Works was personal and perfect Obedience.* The peculiar Covenant made with the carnal Seed promised eternal Life only on the Condition of perfect Obedience; but the Possession of *Canaan* was first given

given to that People by the free Favour of God to them, tho' their continuance in it depended on their Observation of the Duties of the Law, both Moral and Ceremonial.

4. *This Covenant is not different in Nature from the Covenant God made with him in the foregoing Chapters. For here God doth not say, I will make a Covenant, much less another Covenant, but I will establish my Covenant, &c.* The Lord, in *Gen. xvii. 7.* lets *Abraham* know that the Covenant, which he was now about to make with him for his natural Seed, of which he appointed Circumcision for the Sign, was so far from disannulling the former Covenant which he had made with him for his spiritual Seed, that it was rather confirm'd by it, by separating his Seed in this Ordinance of Circumcision, and allotting them the Land of *Canaan*, wherein they should dwell by themselves, and not be reckoned among other Nations, till that Seed of his, in whom all Nations should be blessed, should be brought forth. But as has been said before, the Defence neither of our Principles nor Practice requires me to prove it was a Covenant of a different Nature, from what God had before made with *Abraham*; since if it be taken for the sure and everlasting Covenant of Grace, it is not the carnal Seed, but the spiritual, which are here intended. So *Dr. Owen, Saints Persever. p. 175.* "The Persons to whom this Promise is made, are called *thee*, and *thy Seed*, that is, all those, and only those, with whom God is a God in Covenant. God here minds them of the first making of this Covenant with *Abraham, Gen. xvii. 7.* Now who are this Seed of *Abraham*? Not all his carnal Posterity, not the whole Nation of the *Jews*. Our Saviour not only denies, but also proves by many Arguments, that the *Pharisees* and their Followers, who doubtless were of the Nation of the *Jews*, and the carnal Seed of *Abraham*, were not the Children of *Abraham* in this Sense, but rather the *Devil's*, *John viii. 39, 40, 41.* And the Apostle disputes and argues the same Case, *Rom. iv. 9, 10, 11.* and proves undeniably, that it is *Believers only*, whether *circumcised* or *uncircumcised*, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, that are this Seed of *Abraham*, and Heirs of the Promise. So plainly, *Gal. iii. 7.* Know ye therefore, that they which are of Faith, the same are the Children of *Abraham*. And then concludes again as the Issue of his Debate, *ver. 9.* So then, they which are of Faith are blessed with faithful *Abraham*.

Thus far the *Doctor*. If it was therefore allow'd that the Covenant mentioned *Gen. xvii. 7.* is the Covenant of Grace, it will avail him nothing, unless he could prove all the Offspring of Believers to be of this Seed, and all the Offspring of Unbelievers to come short of that Privilege. And could that be tolerably got over, there is no less a Difficulty yet behind, which is, that every one in Covenant ought to be baptiz'd, whether they make Profession of Faith or not. Let him prove that Covenant-interest gives the Children of Believers a Right to Baptism, more than to the Lord's Supper; since himself and others call the latter a *Seal* of the Covenant, as well as the former, and the Word of God no more directs us to administer one Ordinance on that account, than the other. And that God should make that the Ground to his Ministers for the Administration of Ordinances, when it is beyond their Power to discern either of the Offspring of Believers or Unbelievers, who has, or who has not such an Interest, I must have better evidence than I have yet met with to perswade me to believe it. But a credible Profession of Faith, whereon alone the primitive Ministers, so far as the Word of God (design'd by him to be our *Directory* in all Ages) informs us, did administer it, is what lies within the compass of their Ability to judge of.

I come now to his *ninth* Argument, *That therein God promised himself to be a God to Abraham and his Seed; and therefore it must be the Covenant of Grace.* This hath been answer'd before, *p. 14, 15.* to which I refer the Reader.

What he next affirms is of no weight, *That the denial of the Covenant, Gen. xvii. 7, 8. to be the Covenant of Grace, supposeth a very uncomfortable Error to all that hold it, viz. That temporal good things are not New Covenant Blessings.* For as there is a vast difference between a Promise of so much of the good things of this Life, as the wise God knows to be best, and a durable Inheritance in that Land which flowed with Milk and Honey; so the Denial of the Promise in *Gen. xvii.* to belong to believing *Gentiles* and their Seed, doth not suppose any such thing as he affirms.

When he says, *That Canaan was promised in the same Covenant, in which the Lord promiseth to give a new Heart and a new Spirit, &c.* I need only reply, that either God did not promise a new Heart and a new Spirit to all the natural Posterity of *Abraham*, to whom he promised *Canaan*; or else, that he did not make good what he had promised.

And

And 'tis no less evident that God hath given a *new Heart* and *new Spirit* to many Thousands, to whom he never promised the literal *Canaan*.

What he tells us in the next place, That *in that Covenant Heaven it self, under that Canaan, as a Type of it, was promised to Abraham and his Seed for ever, for an everlasting Possession*; is either untrue, or else overthrows his whole Design in this place. For that Promise was not made to the natural Seed of *Abraham*, as such, seeing a Remnant of them only partook of it, *Rom. xi. 5.* which is equally true of the Offspring of believing *Gentiles*. And if it was not made to the natural Posterity of the former, much less to all the Offspring of the latter.

His tenth and last Argument, That the Covenant of God with *Abraham*, *Gen. xvii. 7.* is renewed to the Church of *Israel, Men, Women and Children*, *Deut. xxix. 10, 11, &c.* hath been sufficiently answer'd in the *Introduction*, by what hath been proved there from Scripture, of the twofold Covenant, which God made with *Abraham*, the one for his spiritual, and the other for his natural Seed; that mention'd *Deut. xxix.* being the formal Reception of the latter into that Covenant, which he had before transacted with *Abraham* for them.

Whereas he saith, *p. 25.* That *this Covenant was made with Abraham 400 Years before the Covenant at Horeb was made with all Israel*; the Covenant of Grace, *Gen. xii. 4.* was made with him 430 Years before that Covenant at *Horeb* (called the Law in distinction from the Promise) was made with all *Israel*, and the Covenant of Circumcision, *Gen. xvii.* twenty four Years after the former, as was shewn before, *p. 23.*

And as to what he affirms in the same *Page*, that the Covenant at *Horeb*, and that with *Abraham*, were in the main substance one and the same Covenant of Grace; if by the Covenant with *Abraham* he mean the Covenant established with him for his spiritual Seed, it hath been disproved already, and the contrary is fully demonstrated by *Dr. O.* in the place little before mentioned. The great number of Scriptures here and elsewhere cited by him in favour of what he asserts, can be of no further service than to amuse the reader.

He afterwards tells us, That the Covenant at *Horeb* is *abolished, but not all things delivered at Horeb*; and mentions two

two Exceptions: (1.) *God's free Promise to be a God to his People and their Seed.* (2.) *The Ten Commandments in the hands of Christ, to be observed as a Rule of Life.* The latter I readily grant him; but must suspend my Belief of the former, as it depends on one of these two *Postulata* so much improved: That every believing Parent hath the same Promises made to him for his Seed, that were made to *Abraham* for his: Or, That all the Children of believing Gentiles are, in a Scripture sense, the Seed of *Abraham*; either of which 'tis desired he would make good.

He proceeds to demand, Whether our *Blessed Lord* came to repeal and take from his People precious Promises and Privileges? and endeavours in many Words to shew the Absurdity of such a Thought. If he thinks this affects us, he would do well (as we say) to look at home, and assign some better Reason than any he has done yet, why Children should not be now admitted to the Lord's Supper, as well as formerly to the Passover.

C H A P. IV.

An Answer to Mr. H's Fourth Chapter.

THE Objection with which Mr. H. begins this Chapter, as against his own Opinion, I am now much concerned in. For as I know not by whom this place, *Gal. iii. 16.* with the Exposition he here gives it is urged against Pedobaptism; so I am well assured the Antipedobaptists Cause stands in no need of such a Support. But since 'tis so proposed, that by the Answer return'd, the *Anabaptists* (as he calls them) might be render'd ridiculous and the most uncharitable Persons under Heaven to their own Babes, I shall not wholly wave the Consideration of it. The Words of the Objection are: *All the Promises made to the Seed of Abraham, were made to Christ personal only; he only is that Seed to whom all the Promises were made.*

In *Gen. xii. 3.* the Covenant of Grace is revealed to *Abraham*, with this Assurance, that he, in whom all Believers should be blessed, should descend from him according to the Flesh: *And in thee (i. e. in Christ to come of thy Seed) shall all the Families of the Earth be blessed.* Compare *Gen. xxii. 18.* *And in thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be blessed.*

blessed, with Gal. iii. 16, 19. Now to Abraham and his
 Seed were the Promises made : He saith not to Seeds, as of
 many, but as of one, and to thy Seed, which is Christ. Where-
 fore then serveth the Law ? It was added because of Trans-
 gression, till the Seed should come, to whom the Promise was
 made. Now that 'tis to those Passages in Genesis that the
 Apostle hath respect in these Words, I think will appear to
 any one who impartially considers both places. And that
 is Christ *personal*, who is primarily intended, is so evident
 in the 19 Ver. that I can't but very much wonder Mr. H.
 should spend no less than four Pages to prove the contrary.
 If the actual Exhibition of Christ, the promised Seed, in
 the Flesh, be not there meant by the *Seed's coming*, I desire
 to know who is or can be. Christ *mystical*, or the *Church*
of Christ, it cannot be; for Christ always had a Church,
 before the Law and under the Law, as well as under the
 Gospel : and Mr. Pool's *Annotations* on this Verse, tell us ;
 That Christ is here to be understood by the *Seed*, is plain
 by the Addition, *to whom the Promise was made*. Nor can
 discern how Mr. H's *Exposition* can possibly consist with
 the Design of the Apostle in this place, or what tolerable
 sense he can give of his Words in Ver. 19. unless Christ
personal be there intended. For it is in him alone who
 sprang from Abraham according to the Flesh, that all
 the Nations of the Earth, *i. e.* Believers in all Nations, are
 blessed. Neither will any of the direful Consequences follow
 from such an Exposition, which he indeavours on all Occa-
 sions to deduce from our Opinion, and expose us to his Rea-
 ders, as imbracing Notions which destroy the Foundation
 of our own Comfort. For Christ is not here to be confide-
 ed as standing in a private, but publick Capacity, as the
 Head and Representative of all the Seed given him of the
 Father ; and the Promises of the New Covenant are made
 to him, as such, and to his Seed in him, who derive their
 Right to them by their Union with him, to whom as their
 Head and Surety they are primarily made. And therefore,
 notwithstanding what Mr. H's *Charity* suggests, *that we will*
exclude our selves out of the Promises, rather than suffer our
Children to be included ; our interpreting this place of Christ
personal, affords as much Comfort to believing Parents,
 and their faithful Children, as his own Exposition can be
 justly supposed to do. And I judge it my Duty here to call
 upon him to retract and repent of that false and injurious

Accu-

76 *An Answer to Mr. H's Fourth Chapter.*

Accusation of his Brethren, without any colour of Truth or Justice. The whole Paragraph runs thus, p. 30.

This Objection design'd against the Seed of Believers, is as much against adult Believers as their Children: For if the Promises are to none but Christ personal, then they are neither to believing Parents, nor their Children. But the truth is, this proves them to be sure to all Believers, whether Parents or Children. He adds; *See and pity the Zeal of these Persons against their own Babes, who will exclude themselves out of the Promises, rather than suffer their Children to be included.*

Is this speaking the Truth in Love, to charge us as destitute of natural Affections, to such a degree, as that instead of desiring (as every Believer cannot but do) the eternal Salvation of our Offspring, we desire their eternal Perdition.

I am as little concerned in the next *Objection*, as in the former: *We often read that the Jews owned and trusted Abraham's Covenant, and gloried much in being his Children but yet they rejected Christ.* Wherefore instead of that, let him answer this following, viz. The Jews, who, according to his own Exposition, were the Seed of Abraham, to whom the Promise is made, Gen. xvii. 7. did not, as to the greater number of them, attain to the saving Knowledge of God. But the Lord in the Covenant of Grace hath assured us by Promise, that all the Seed in Covenant, from the least to the greatest, shall be blessed with a saving Knowledge of himself. And the Apostle tells us, Rom. iv. 16. *That the Promise is sure to all the Seed.* Which Words the Annotations before mentioned very well expound thus: "If it were of the Law, it would be unsure and uncertain, because of Man's Weakness, who is not able to perform it. Abraham's Seed is of two sorts; one sort is of the Law, to wit, the Jews; another sort is of such as walk in the Steps of Abraham's Faith, whether Jews or Gentiles: To all these the Promise must be sure, which cannot be, if the Law be made the Condition or Means of the Inheritance."

P. 34. He presents us with another *Objection* against himself, viz. *The Seed of Believers are by Nature the Children of Wrath, even as others,* Eph. ii. 3. The Cause of the Antipedobaptists is sufficiently maintained from other Arguments, whether this *Objection* carry weight enough in it or not, to overthrow his Fabric. But I cannot perceive that what he has said against it is of any force.

His first Reply, of *their being so before Christ's coming, and* that yet then they enjoy'd the Privileges pleaded for, depends wholly upon this Supposition; that the Covenant into which the carnal Seed of Abraham was receiv'd, is the very same Substance that believing Gentiles are now under. But the Invalidity of this having been already prov'd, I shall not here insist upon any further Refutation of it.

But he proceeds to tell us, *If their being Children of Wrath Nature were inconsistent with their being Children of God Grace, then not one of them that die Infants could be saved.* To which I answer; That if the Parents Hope and Comfort concerning the Salvation of their departed Children be not built on the Covenant of Redemption, transferr'd before time between the Father and Son, as looking on their Seed dying in Infancy to be given of the Father to the Son, and undertaken for by the Son; I see no ground of Hope or Comfort they can have from the Covenant with the carnal Seed, constantly call'd the Law in the New Testament; for thousands of them, who liv'd at mature Age, the Scripture assures us, have dy'd in Sin, and perish'd. The Law, to which Circumcision was so annex'd, as to bind its Subjects to *do the whole Law*, Gal. v. could not possibly give Life to young or old, Gal. iii. 12.

How pertinent he supposes what he next asserts, touching the Covenant-interest, and Right to Heaven, of *believers Infants that die before they are born*, I know not; but it may be certain, that unless he will say they have a Right to Baptism too *before they are born*, it is either remote from his Purpose, or proves, if any thing, more than he desires; for then it must necessarily follow, that some have an Interest in the Covenant before they have a Right to Baptism. And if this be allow'd, one would think he should not account it so *absurd and uncharitable*, as he would persuade his Readers, that the Antipedobaptists should wait till Covenant-interest be evidenc'd by a Profession of Faith, before they administer it. And here the Opinion of the Council of Neocæsarea (mention'd by Mr. Bennett and others) in the beginning of the 4th Century, may not improperly be taken Notice of; which to remove the Scruple of some, whether a Woman with Child might warrantably be baptiz'd, in the 6th Canon determines; "That she ought to be baptiz'd when she desires

"it:

78 *An Answer to Mr. H's Fourth Chapter.*

" it: And the Reason given is ; " For in this there is no Com-
 " munion between the Woman with Child, and the Child
 " she goes with, because the proper Choice of each Per-
 " son should be discover'd, and that by a Profession." But
 Mr. H. it seems, is of another Mind, and would per-
 swade us, that the proper Choice of each Person need
 not be discover'd by a Profession, before their Admissi-
 on to it.

He goes on to remove the *Objection*, by citing *Rom. xi. 16*
17, 21, 24, 28. Gal. ii. 15. 1 Cor. vii. 14. The first and
 last of these Places are particularly spoken to afterwards
 in *Chapter vii.* and *Gal. ii. 15.* affords him no Relief. For
 the Apostle denies that himself, *Peter*, and other *Jews* (for
 he here distinguishes between natural *Jews*, and *Profelytes*)
 were justified by the Law, but by Faith in Christ. Now,
 by being interested in the Covenant made with *Abraham*
 for his natural Seed, they had been pardon'd, and sancti-
 fy'd, (as if that was the Covenant of Grace, which Believers,
 both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, are now under, they would
 have been not only so soon as born, but even in the *Womb*
 according to Mr. H's reasoning) they would thereby have
 been deliver'd from trusting to their own legal Righte-
 ousness for Acceptance with God, which it plainly ap-
 pears the Apostle *Paul* did for many Years, even till the
 Lord, by his Sovereign Grace, call'd him, and discover'd
 to him his undone Estate without Christ, *Rom. vii. 9, 10*
11, 13. Phil. iii. 7. *Paul*, notwithstanding his being a *Jew*
 by Nature, and circumcis'd, was in an unregenerate
 State, till he was come to adult Age, and brought, by
 the same effectual working of the Grace of God, to re-
 pent, and believe, whereby those Graces were wrought
 in the *Gentiles*. And the Case is the same in this respect
 with the Offspring of Believers, and those of Unbelie-
 vers. If the Children of Believers are Children of Wrath
 by Desert only, as he would perswade us; but the Chil-
 dren of God, as standing related to him in the Covenant
 of Grace, their Case is the same with that of adult Be-
 lievers; and they cannot justly be told by their Parents
 or Ministers, that they are in a lost, undone Condition,
 standing in need of Regeneration, and lying under the
 guilt of Sin, and the condemning Power of the Law.
 But I hope the Grace of God will prevent any descend-
 ed from godly Parents, from falling into so fatal a Mi-
 stake.

He concludes this Chapter with the Comment of Mr. William Perkins upon that place of *Galatians*, too long to transcribe here; and as to any thing Argumentative in his Words, it hath been already consider'd.

C H A P. V.

An Answer to Mr. H's Fifth Chapter.

WE come now to Mr. H's v. Chapter, which, as the two last, begins with an *Objection*, so laid down, as he thought might best leave room for

Reply, that his Reader might think he had fully answer'd what the Antipedobaptists could say against that which he pleads for. The Substance of it is this; *Altho' Believers Infants, under the Old Testament, were in Covenant, and Partakers of the Seal of the Covenant, yet this was Privilege of the Jews only, &c.*

It is reasonable we should be allow'd to give the Reader Account of our Sentiments, the *Objection*, as form'd by him, being defective in divers respects. And, (1.) We want not, neither can he prove, that the Covenant into which Infants were admitted under the Old Testament, is the Covenant of Grace, the same in Substance that believing *Gentiles* are now under. (2.) Neither do we see that Circumcision, the Token of that Covenant, was Seal or Confirmation of New Covenant-interest to all to whom it was affix'd; and the contrary hath been prov'd ready. (3.) Those that were receiv'd into that Old Covenant, whereof Circumcision was the Sign, deriv'd not their Right to it from the Faith of their Parents; the Infant-Seed of an unbelieving *Jew* having as much Right in it as those Children whose immediate Parents were sincere Believers. (4.) We don't say, that none but natural *Jews* might be circumcis'd; altho' we affirm, that *professed Gentiles* were not admitted to a Participation of all the Privileges of the *Sinai* Covenant, which the natural Seed of *Abraham* enjoy'd by it.

The *Objection*, as stated by him, appearing thus faulty, should not think my self oblig'd to examine his Reply, but for the sake of some Notions in it, both groundless, and incon-

inconsistent with his own Plea in other Places. So p. 38. *At the first Institution of the Token and Seal of the Covenant, not only Abraham and his natural Seed partook of it, but his adult Men Servants, and all their Male seed.* This is directly contrary to what he asserts, p. 108. & 111. In the former he undertakes by a Citation of Scriptures, as numerous, as wide from the Purpose, to prove, *That a godly Man's, or Woman's Child or Children, are his or her House or Household:* And p. 111. *The Covenant of Promise runs not from Masters to Servants, Boarders, or Lodgers, but from Parents to Children:* Whereas he says here, that *Abraham's numerous Household Servants were in this Covenant of God with Abraham, Gen. xvii.* Now his Design thro' his whole Discourse is to prove, that the same Persons that had a Right to Circumcision then, have a Right to Baptism now; and that no Privilege granted of God to his People formerly, is taken away since; and he accounts it very absurd to say, that *Moses* allow'd, and continued to the People of God, more extensive and comfortable Promises and Privileges than *Christ* himself. And I hope he will own 'tis more extensive Promise and Privilege to have Covenant interest, and a Right to the Sign of it, convey'd to Children and Servants both, than to Children only, by the Parents or Masters Faith.

He undertakes in the next place to prove, by a new kind of Logic, that *Abraham* had a godly Family of Servants from the Religious Behaviour of one of them. Because one behav'd himself religiously, it must therefore follow that all of them were Believers. But to put the matter out of doubt, he adds further, from *Gen. xiv. 14.* *That the 319 there mention'd, had been trained or instructed by him, no doubt in Religion, as well as to bear Arms.* Now, altho' that Text, speaking of the warlike Expedition which *Abraham* was then undertaking with these Servants as his Soldiers, must (I think) necessarily intend, they had attain'd some Skill in *Military Discipline*; yet I grant, that *Abraham* was faithful and diligent in instructing all under his Care in the great Concerns of Religion. But will it thence follow, that his Endeavours were successful to the Conversion of his whole numerous Family? For every Male was commanded to be circumcis'd. I know of no Reason that should make me conclude, that *Abraham* had not the same Occasion to complain with the Prophet of old, *Isa. liii.*

Who hath believed our Report, and to whom is the Arm of the Lord revealed? How few, compared with the great Numbers of his Auditors, were converted by the great Apostle of the Gentiles, the Account the Spirit of God gives us of his Ministry and its Success, in the *Acts* of the Apostles, plainly informs us.

But he says, p. 39. *Abraham and his Family being the first Church, or People of God, that partook of the Token and Seal of the Covenant, their Order therein is heedfully to be minded. Abraham, an adult Believer, is first circumcis'd, and then his natural Seed, and his Men-servants, who were adult Believers, were circumcis'd, and their Seed also. How exactly did the Apostles follow this first Pattern, when they first taught Persons? And when they believed, then they baptized both them and their Households.*

As I cannot grant, that the Command for Circumcision was design'd of God to give us Direction with respect to the Subjects of Baptism; so neither doth his comparing the Apostles Administration of the latter, with the first Administration of the former to *Abraham* and his Household, any ways corroborate his Cause. For, (1.) He will acknowledge that the former might not lawfully be administer'd till the eighth Day. Whereas, if he be of the same Mind with other Pedobaptists, he must assert the Right of Infants to the latter from their Birth. (2.) It is only Children, and not Servants, which he afterwards contends have a Right to Baptism by the Faith of others; but in the former a great many Servants were circumcis'd, as well as *Abraham's* only Son *Ishmael*. (3.) It was then only Males that were circumcis'd, but Females are now intituled to Baptism as well as Males. (4.) Faith was not requir'd then either of adult Servants, or Children, as a necessary prerequisite to Circumcision; here the Case is far otherwise, and he can't but own, that no adult Person hath a Right to Baptism without a Profession of Faith and Repentance. Was there any such thing requir'd in the Precept? *Gen. xiii. 12, 13. And he that is eight Days old shall be circumcised among you; --- he that is born in thy House, or bought with thy Money of any Stranger, which is not of thy Seed: he that is born in thy House, and he that is bought with thy Money, must needs be circumcised. And again, Exod. xxi. 44. But every Man's Servant, that is bought for Money, when thou hast circumcis'd him, then shall he eat thereof;*

82 *An Answer to Mr. H's Fifth Chapter.*

viz. of the Passover. On the latter of these Places Mr. Poole hath these Words: "Tho' it is probable, that by their Interest in them, and a diligent Instruction of them, they made them willing to receive Circumcision; yet it seems they had a Power to compel them to it." Here was no such thing as Faith requir'd in the adult, to give them a Right to Circumcision, nor it seems, so much as a willingness to submit to it; which however, rather than be turn'd off from a kind Master and sold to a severe one, it may probably be supposed they were generally wrought up to, when at the same time they might be void of true Faith. By comparing the Commission wherein Baptism is injoin'd, and from whence alone Christ's Ministers receive Authority for its Administration, and the Preaching and Practice of his Apostles in the Execution thereof, with the above cited Institution of Circumcision, and further Directions about it, the Reader will perceive that he had need beware of taking anything upon Mr. H's Word, without first searching the Scriptures, with the noble Bereans, to see whether the things are so or not. The Commission requires Faith before Baptism, *Matth.* xxviii. 19. *Mar.* xvi. 16. So Peter, in his Sermon, *Acts* ii. 38. first calls on them to repent, and then be baptiz'd. And agreeable to it was his Practice, *Ver.* 4. Then they that gladly receiv'd his Word were baptiz'd, and the same Day there were added unto them about 3000 Souls. And *Chap.* viii. 12, 36, 37. But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ, they were baptiz'd, both Men and Women. And as they went on their way, they came unto certain Water; and the Eunuch said, See, here is Water: what doth hinder me to be baptiz'd? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine Heart, thou mayest. And here we may observe, that the Eunuch only, and not his Servants with him, was then baptiz'd: for *Ver.* 38. He commanded the Chariot to stand still, and they went down both into the Water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptiz'd him. That this great Man undertook such a long Journey without any Servants to attend him, cannot be suppos'd, and there was Opportunity to baptize them as well as himself. But as if the Spirit of God design'd to let us know, that the primitive Ministers were far from taking their Directions from the Subjects of Circumcision, to those of Baptism.

tho' all *Abraham's* Servants were circumcis'd the same Day with himself; we are told here, that only *Philip and the Eunuch went down into the Water, and there Philip baptiz'd him*, but not his Servants. So likewise *Acts xviii. 8. And Crispus, the chief Ruler of the Synagogue, believ'd on the Lord, with all his House; and many of the Corinthians hearing, believ'd, and were baptiz'd.* Nor do we read of any baptiz'd, who did not profess to believe, not they and their Servants, and Children, unless they also believ'd as well as their Parents and Masters. When Circumcision was renew'd at *Gilgal*, after the Children of *Israel* were come over *Jordan* into *Canaan*, they circumcis'd all the People (*i. e.* all the Males) who before were uncircumcis'd, some of whom were near 40 Years of Age, none having been circumcis'd during their 40 Years Stay in the Wilderness. But here is no Intimation either of God's requiring that the *Believers* among them should be circumcis'd, which would have included a Prohibition of any others; or that *Joshua* made any Distinction between Believers and Unbelievers in its Administration. But the Text tells us, that they circumcis'd *all the People*, *Josh. v. 8.* Now let him either prove that all the Males, both Fathers and Children, Masters and Servants, that were circumcis'd, were professing Believers; or else own that the Apostles did not (whatever he pretends) exactly conform their Administration of Baptism to that of Circumcision, as its Pattern.

It may not be improper to consider in this place, what he alleges afterwards, *p. 107, &c.* concerning the *baptizing of Households*, whereof he gives three Instances; *The Jailer and his Household, Acts xvi. 33. Lydia and her Household, Acts xvi. 14, 15. And the Household of Stephanas, 1 Cor. i. 16.* And (1.) There were many Thousands of the *Jews* who believ'd, and were baptiz'd; among all of whom we do not read of any one baptiz'd *Household*. Many Churches of baptiz'd Believers were likewise gather'd among the *Gentiles*, and in all these we are presented but with three Instances; nay some Expositors make them but two, and tell us, that *Stephanas*, mention'd *1 Cor. i. 16.* was the converted *Jailer* in *Acts 16.* Now, that two or three Families only should be baptiz'd, when there is no question to be made, but one, if not both of the Heads of some thousands of Families at that time believ'd, looks with no fa-

84 *An Answer to Mr. H's Fifth Chapter.*

yourable Aspect upon his Cause. And by this we may see, that when the Gospel took place upon all in a Family, the Spirit of God takes particular Notice of it. Let him assign a good Reason, when the great Numbers, mention'd *Acts* ii. 41. vii. 12. & xviii. 8. are recorded to have been baptiz'd, why it should not have been said, that they and their *Houssholds* were baptiz'd, if proper Faith was not necessary to intitle to it. But the mentioning of two or three Instances only, shews it was only where the whole *House* believ'd, and not a common thing. (2.) There are many Families in which there are no young Children, and unless he could prove there were any in these, which he will find impossible to do, they make nothing to his Purpose. (3.) As to the *Houssholds* of the *Jailer*, and *Stephanas*, if they were two Persons, there is such an Account given us of them, as one would think sufficient to prevent their being wrested to any such Purpose, for which Mr. H. produceth them. For, of the *Jailer* it is said, *Acts* xvi. 32. *And they spake unto him the Word of the Lord, and to all that were in his House*; and in *Verse* 34. *Herejoic'd, believing in God with all his House*: So that all who were baptiz'd here, were first preach'd unto, and believ'd. In like manner 'tis said of the *Housshold* of *Stephanas*, *1 Cor.* xvi. 15. *that they addicted themselves to the Ministry of the Saints*. Which Infants are unable to do. And as for *Lydia*, as we read of no Children she had; so from what is recorded of her, 'tis (I think) reasonable to conclude, that she had no Husband; for if she had, he must have been the Head of that baptiz'd *Housshold*. And 'tis highly improbable that mention should be made of the Baptism of her, and her *Housshold*, and afterwards *Ver.* 40. *that they enter'd into the House of Lydia*, and no notice be taken of her Husband. Moreover, we are told, that *they there saw the Brethren, and comforted*, or (as the Word also signifies) exhorted them. And young Children are incapable of receiving Comfort, or profiting by Exhortations.

But he tells us, *From these three Instances it's as clear, that the Apostles common Practice was to baptize adult Believers and their Houssholds, as from those two Instances of baptizing Lydia, and some Women at Samaria, Acts* xvi. 15. & viii. 12. 'tis evident that their common Practice was to baptize Women as well as Men. That the Apostles baptiz'd *Houssholds*, when whole *Houssholds* believ'd, we readily

dily grant, and should gladly practise the same. But he had need have a *clear Head*, that can discover the same Reason for baptizing *Infants*, as *Women*, in Holy Writ; since the Practice of the first Ministers, who were under the infallible Conduct of the Holy Spirit, is a sufficient Warrant for our imitation as to the latter; and there is not one Word any where mentioned of the former. Nay that this is contrary to the Tenor of their Commission, shall be shewn afterwards in *Chap. vii.*

But he proceeds to offer several *Objections* to the Instances he had mentioned, which, according to his usual Method, he afterwards attempts to answer.

Object. 1. *Children are not expressed in those Texts that speak of baptizing Households.* To this his Answer is: *If they are not expressed, then they are not excluded; and if not excluded, then are they included.*

Mr. H's Logic will as well prove their unbelieving Servants to be *included*, if they had any, because they are not expressly excluded; and he can't but know, that general Terms do not always intend every Individual. Besides, as there are not Infants in every House, so there is not only no mention made of Children in those Texts, but (as I said before) such an Account is given us of the Families, as if the Spirit of God design'd to prevent the making any such Conclusion thence as he pretends to.

As to what he tells us, p. 108. *That a godly Man's or Woman's Children are his or her Household*, it has been spoke to already in the beginning of this Chapter.

Object. 2. *They spake the Word of the Lord to the Jailor, and to all that were in his House. Would they preach to Children?* To which he answers: *Yes, they would, and so would those too that make this Objection, did they but understand, and put their Consciences under the Authority of the following Scriptures: Eph. vi. 4. Prov. xxii. 26. Deut. vi. 7. and xxxi. 12, 13. and xxix. 9. with x. 11. Josh. viii. 34, 35. Col. iii. 20. Psal. xxxiv. 11. and lxxviii. 4, to 7. It's no Absurdity to preach the Gospel to an Infant, Luke i. 76, 77, 78, 79.*

Tho' we desire to subject our Minds to the Authority of God's Word; yet we cannot look upon our selves bound by these Scriptures to *preach to Infants.* And if he don't intend such, but only those Children who are arrived to Years of Understanding, what he says here is as little to the purpose, as the other is absurd. *Luke the i. 76, &c. is remote*
G 3 enough

enough from proving what he says in the former Sense. For it is a most ridiculous Conceit, that *Zachariah* there preached to *John*; when for the sake of the Audience he uttered that Prophetical Declaration of the Work whereunto God had design'd him. If his Reasoning was good, Gospel Ministers have warrant from *Isa. i. 2. Psal. cxiv. 5, 6.* with many more places, to preach to senseless and inanimate Creatures. But who are to be preached to, we are informed *Nehem. viii. 2. And Ezra the Priest brought the Law before the Congregation, both of Men and Women, and all that could hear with Understanding, i. e.* such Children that were arriv'd to Years of Understanding. And such, we are as willing as he, should be taught, tho' but young, and upon Profession of Faith baptiz'd.

Object. 3. *But the Jailer believed in God with all his House.* To which he replies: *The Children of Believers, as such (whilst Children at least) are reckon'd among the Faithful, i. e. Believers.*

If this be so, how comes it to pass that in *Tit. i. 6.* 'tis mention'd as one necessary Qualification in a Bishop, or Elder, that he be one who hath faithful Children? Had all the Children of every Believer been accounted of that number, there would have been no occasion of giving this Direction to the Church.

Object. 4. *It is said that Lydia was a Woman of Thyatira, tho' now at Philippi, and that it's unlikely she should bring her Children with her so far from home.*

Tho' this Objection be not very material to the Controversy, yet I can't but take notice of what he so boldly asserts in his Answer to it, when he tells us, *It's clear that her House (i. e. her Children) was with her at Philippi, and were baptized as hers, immediately upon her being baptized her self.* For that nothing is clear in it, but that he can venture to say what he knows nothing of, is plain from what has been spoken before in *Page 84,* relating to this Instance of *Lydia.*

Object. 5. *The Household of Stephanas, baptized by Paul, ministred to the Saints; therefore they were not Children, 1 Cor. xvi. 15.* To which he replies: *This is no proof they were not Children when the Apostle baptiz'd them, but 'tis a proof that their Baptism, as an House of a godly Father, was not in vain, &c.*

This don't prove indeed they were not Children, for such they might be, tho' adult. And whether this *first Epistle to the Corinthians* was written by the Apostle from *Ephesus*, as *Beza* and many other Learned Men think; or, as others suppose, not long after from *Philippi*, in his Passage thro' *Macedonia*; had any of the *Household of Stephanas* (suppose them his Children, or whom else you please) not arriv'd 3 Years of Understanding when *Paul* baptiz'd them, they could not have been capable of addicting themselves to the Ministry of the Saints at the time this *Epistle* was wrote. For any one, who is not a Stranger to Scripture *Chronology*, will easily perceive, that according to either of these Opinions, the *Epistle* must have been writ within three Years after his leaving *Corinth*. And whereas he urges their *ministry to the Saints*, as a Proof that *their Baptism as an House* (a godly Parent was not in vain; 'tis so apparent, that many Children, who have been (in his reckoning) baptiz'd on account of their Parents Faith, have prov'd wicked and profane, as might convince him that this can be of no force.

He proceeds to tell us, There is no Colour from the Texts to say those Households were baptiz'd as adult single Persons, on their own personal Profession. But unless he can prove adult Persons may be baptiz'd without a personal Profession of Faith, I think, from what has been said, there is very good reason to conclude, *there is no Colour* for what he affirms; there being nothing in any of those Texts that affords just ground to suppose, that any but actual Believers were admitted to Baptism, or who should not have been baptiz'd, whether the Parent, Master, or Mistress had believed, or not. Sometimes the Gospel, both then and since, has been made efficacious for the Conversion of every one in an House. So *John iv. 53*. 'tis said of the Nobleman, who obtain'd of Christ a miraculous Cure for his sick Son, that *himself believed and his whole House*. And no doubt but among those *Corinthians* mentioned *Acts xviii. 8*. there were many who were Heads of Families; but 'tis mentioned, as a special effect of sovereign Grace, that *Crispus and all his House* believed. If the whole Families of all of them believed and were baptiz'd, why should one only be mention'd? When whole Families therefore believed and were baptiz'd, it is so recorded; but when only one or more particular Persons in a Family, they only were so privileged.

I should but abuse the Reader's Patience to insist long upon what follows in p. 111. where he says; *Compare these Texts, which speak of baptizing new converted Persons and their Households, with those that speak of saving new converted Persons and their Houses, and we shall find that Children are intended in or by the term House.* Luke xix. 9. *This Day (i. e. the Day of his Conversion) is Salvation come to this House,* forasmuch as he also is the Son of *Abraham.* Acts xvi. 31. *Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved and thy House.* *If the Lord save the Houses, as such, of those Gentiles who believe, and his Apostles baptize the Houses, as such, of those Gentiles who believe, for both which the Texts are express and full; then converted Gentiles and their Seed were baptized, as formerly the Proselytes (who were converted Gentiles) and their Seed were circumcised, &c.* According to Mr. H's way of arguing therefore, when the Head of a Family is converted, the whole House is consequently saved. But St. Luke does not tell us that all in *Zacheus's* House were saved, but that *Salvation was then come to that House*; which it did if only he himself was put into a State of Salvation, and the Means of it thro' him brought to all in it. Nay Salvation might then be said to come to *Zacheus's* House, in that Christ was come into it, whom God the Father had given to be his *Salvation to the Ends of the Earth,* Isa. xlix. 6. In which Sense also Christ tells the Jews, *The Kingdom of God was come unto them,* Matt. xii. 28. But sure all to whom the Doctrine and Means of Salvation come, are not saved. Besides, when he makes these Cases parallel with the Circumcision of *Gentile Proselytes*, how will this consist with what he says afterwards in the same Page: *The Covenant of Promise runs not from Masters to Servants, Boarders or Lodgers, but from Parents to Children:* for all the Male Servants of *Gentile Proselytes* were circumcised? But I shall leave him for a while to consider of this, and return to his V Chapter.

He goes on to tell us, p. 39. *That at the first Institution of Circumcision many hundreds of others, that were not Abraham's natural Seed, were taken into his Covenant and its Privileges.* And yet, p. 40. he says, *That not one of all Abraham's numerous Family, excepting himself, had any Promise that themselves or their Seed should inherit the literal Canaan.* How he will reconcile these Passages, I can't tell. For altho' he under-

undertakes to prove that the literal *Canaan* was not all that was promised in that Covenant, whereof he makes Circumcision to have been the *Seal*; yet he doth not pretend that it was not one thing promised by it. And if Circumcision was a *Seal* of the Covenant to all to whom it was administered, it must give them a Right to each of the Promises of that Covenant, whereof the literal *Canaan* fully appears to be one, *Gen. xvii. 8.* So that I conclude from his own Reasoning, that altho' Circumcision was a *Sign* of that Covenant made with *Abraham* upon all, yet it was not a *Seal* of it to all the Circumcised.

We are told, *p. 41.* *There is no exception made against any other Profelytes Communion with the Church of Israel, but only those half Children of Abraham's Faith, who will have the Token of the Covenant apply'd to themselves, but not to their Children. If any such should have offer'd themselves, they were to have been kept back from the Passover, which was the same for substance with our Lord's Supper, till the Token of the Covenant was apply'd to their Children. And a little after; Abraham's Pattern is always to be followed.*

If this be true, won't it likewise reach those who exclude servants from a Right to the Token of the Covenant, which he knows *Abraham* apply'd to his?

What follows in the next Paragraph, where he tells us; *Those are greatly mistaken, that think none but Abraham's natural Seed enjoy'd this Privilege, to have their Children Members of the visible Church, and in Covenant, &c. needs no Reply. For, that circumcised Profelytes had such a Right, I know of none who deny.* But that they had not, in all respects, the same Interest in the Promises made to *Abraham* for his natural Seed, as his Offspring by *Isaac* had, he has already granted.

He proceeds to ask, *What Scripture or Reason puts this vast difference betwixt believing Gentiles before Christ's coming, and believing Gentiles since; that they and their Seed with them should when be received into the visible Church, and that now their Seed should be left in Satan's Kingdom, &c?* The Church-state is now altered by his own Confession, *pag. 72.* being then National, but now Congregational, as the Scripture abundantly testifies; then it was propagated by Generation, now by Regeneration, *John iii. 3, 5.* which is enough to satisfy him, that both Scripture and Reason make the difference we

we plead for. As to Believers Seed under the Gospel, if their Privileges be not the same in all respects as before, the Change is much for the better.

We are afterwards admonished to learn of the Swallow where to lay her Young; and not to be like the Ostrich, forgetful of her Young ones (as he expresses it) but to consider what we do, when we persecute and thrust our tender Babes out of the visible Church, and out of the Covenant of Promise, &c. Can Mr. H. think 'tis in the power of Men to thrust their Children out of the Covenant of Promise; or by any Act of theirs to bring them into it? If he does not, as I can't suppose he does, where is the Charity of such Reflections as these? 'Tis certainly our Duty to use all Means appointed by God for the good of their Souls, and to seek earnestly for his Blessing thereon; and this, we hope, we are as careful to perform as himself. And as for Persecution, he would do well first to pull the Beam out of his own Eye, since mocking and hard Speeches against those who fear God, are so accounted in Scripture. What must those think of us who are Strangers to our Sentiments and Behaviour, upon reading such Reproaches as he frequently loads us with? Many of which I have already cited from him, and I need not look many Lines further to produce a fresh Instance, when he says, *Let believing Parents take heed of such uncomfortable, rigid and cruel Principles and Practices against their tender Babes, lest in time their Spirits grow sour'd thereby, that they be ready, as hath been the Case of too many, to contend more earnestly to have their Children in this wretched Condition, than for any part of the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints, Jude 3. which this contended for never was.* But I hope that which we contend for in this case, will appear more consonant to the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints, than what he has advanced to the contrary, notwithstanding such harsh Expressions, and the opprobrious Charge with which he next assaults us.

Neither, saith he, hath this their Folly departed from them, altho they have been bray'd in the Mortar of Scripture Evidence, by the preaching and writing of the greatest and best Men the Church hath had, either in or since the Reformation.

That there were very great and good Men at the beginning of the Reformation, and since, who have asserted and pleaded for Pedobaptism, I readily grant; and 'twas an effect of the

the great Mercy and Grace of God, that they saw so far as they did into the gross Superstitions of *Popery*; but that they were convinc'd of all the Errors that abounded in those dark Times, he doth not think himself, if his Practice may be allow'd to interpret his Sentiments. And their Practice of Pedobaptism can be no better Proof of its Warrantableness, than of other things which he rejects. That their reformation was a good Step, but an ill Standard, many great Men have asserted. But have there been no eminent and good Men among the Antipedobaptists? The Works of some of them yet praise them in the Gate, and may do so in future Generations, when such Births as this of his are buried in Oblivion. And are they to be arraign'd at Mr. H's Bar, as stupid and incorrigible Fools?

But he goes on to upbraid us, *That we will not be of Abraham's Faith, which took hold of the Covenant for both Parent and Child, for himself and his Seed, and should therefore seek for another Pattern of our Faith; but one of our Faith, or rather Unbelief concerning Infants, we cannot find in Scripture.*

That *Abraham* believed God would receive all his own immediate Offspring into the Covenant of Grace, will be no hard a Task for him ever to prove. *Abraham* had an *Ismael*, as well as an *Isaac*; and if *Abraham* believed that all his carnal Seed should be interested therein, his Faith was built on some Promise of God; and if God had promised it, he would have perform'd it. But having largely before demonstrated the contrary, I shall only add, that one of his Faith, or rather Presumption, concerning Infants, we cannot find in Scripture; which I may well conclude, because he hath produced no such Instance. But he proceeds to frame an *Objection* for us against what he said last.

Object. *If every Believer must be of Abraham's Faith, then every Believer must believe that himself is a common Covenant-head to all the Faithful in all Ages after him, as Abraham was.* To which he replies: *Not so, my Brethren, that was not Abraham's Faith. To be of Abraham's Faith is to believe as he did, that God made his Covenant of Grace with him, as a common Covenant-head for himself and his Seed, and for all Believers and their Seed in their Generations.*

We have here then a Concession, that Believers stand not related to others as Covenant-heads, as *Abraham* did; from whence it must necessarily follow, that the Covenant-interest of

of the Seed of Believers must be derived from their Relation to *Abraham*, as their Father. And this cannot be but one of these two ways ; either in proceeding from him by natural Descent, which will not be said ; or as partaking of Regeneration and Faith, whereby alone any become his spiritual Children ; and all the Offspring of Believers are not so privileged. To be of *Abraham's* Faith then is, (1.) For a Person to believe his being justify'd before God by the Righteousness of Christ alone, and not by the Works of the Law, *Rom. iv. 1, 2, 3.* tho' good Works may declare before Men that this Faith is genuine, and of the right kind ; in which Sense St. *James* ascribes *Abraham's* Justification to Works, *Jam. ii. 21.* (2.) That God will perform all the Promises made to him, whatsoever Difficulties lie in his way, *Rom. iv. 13, 19, 20, 21.* which is true of all sincere Believers, tho' few of them exert so strong a Faith as he did. (3.) *Abraham's* Faith wrought in him a Willingness to obey God in all his Commands, *Heb. xi. 8.* And herein all true Believers are of his Faith, and walk in his Steps, *Rom. iv. 12.* But Mr. *H.* tells us, that *Abraham* believed that God had established his Covenant with him, for all Believers and their Seed in their Generations. Let him prove therefore all the Seed of Believers to be, in this Sense, *Abraham's* Seed, and that God promised *Abraham* to receive them all into the Covenant of Grace, before he expect us to believe that was *Abraham's* Faith. And it is to be observed, that he does not only assert the Interest of the immediate, but remote Seed of Believers in the Covenant of Grace ; for so it is certain the Lord intended in the Covenant made with *Abraham*, *Gen. xvii. 7.* concerning their Seed in their Generations.

When he intreats us to shew a plain and express Command of God for what we do, or a plain Example that the Parents were receiv'd to Church fellowship and Baptism, and their Infant-seed kept back from both, 'tis an Intimation that he finds the Province he hath undertaken too heavy for him ; for otherwise he need not put it upon us to prove the Negative ; as if we were oblig'd to produce an express Prohibition, that Infants should not be baptiz'd, or else own their Right to it. Where hath God declar'd that there shall not be in the Gospel Church a *Pontifex Maximus*, with *Priests* under him, and *Levites* to serve them ? Or were

Are these no Privileges when granted of God to that Church? Was it not a Privilege to have Children then admitted to the Passover, to which he tells us, the Lord's Supper now answers? And hath he produc'd any express Command or Example to deny them the Lord's Supper? Will all only therefore remind him of his own Words: *To de-*
the Continuance of Privileges once granted of God to his
ple, before Proof made of God's revoking such grant of Pri-
lege, is making too bold with his Authority. Let him clear
own Practice from this Charge, before he fix it upon
ers.

C H A P. VI.

An Answer to Mr. H's Sixth Chapter.

THis Chapter begins with such an *Objection*, as no Antipedobaptist, so far as I have observ'd, ever made, viz. *That our Lord Jesus Christ, when on earth, turn'd the Infants out of Doors, not suffering them to continue any longer Members of his visible Church and Kingdom, &c.*

We are far from *turning them out of Doors*, and desire to have a tender regard both to their Bodies and Souls. But we will do well to consider how to avoid the Force of this Objection. For, the Children, whose immediate Parents were Believers (if a continued Course of open Prophaneness may denominate Persons to be such) were born Members of the Jewish Church, as well as those of the most eminent Believers; and yet it is the Covenant-interest, Church-membership of Believers Children only that is contended for.

But let us hear his Answer. *If they were turn'd out, it must be either by Christ himself, or his Apostles.* And if Christ himself did not do it, he labours to prove divers Instances, as (1.) From his Discourse with the Woman of Samaria, where he tells her, *Salvation is of the Jews.* (2.) From his calling the Jews Children, and the Greeks Dogs, Mark vii. 26, 27. (3.) From his Commanding the Seventy, when they entred into an House, to say, *Peace be*

to this House, Luke x. 3. (4.) From what he said of the Child, which he set in the midst of his Disciples, Mark ix. 36. (5.) From his telling Zaccheus, *This Day is Salvation come to this House*, forasmuch as he also is the Son of Abraham. (6.) From his taking little Children in his Arms and commanding his Disciples to suffer them to come to him with the Reason of that Command; *For of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*. But none of these Instances reach the Point in hand, as will appear by a particular Examination of them. For, before the Death of Christ the Constitution of the Church was not alter'd, nor the middle Wall of Partition between Jew and Gentile broke down, nor the first Covenant taken away, that the second might be establish'd.

For the I. When our Lord saith, *Salvation is of Jews*, it imports, that they enjoy'd the Oracles of God the means of Salvation, and that the Word of the Lord came from them to go forth to others, as *Isa. ii. 3*.

As to the II. Of Christ's calling the Jews Children but the Gentiles Dogs, it only shews, as I said before, that the Partition-wall between Jew and Gentile, the Foundation whereof was laid in that Covenant of Peculiarity which God made with Abraham for his natural Seed still remain'd.

His III. Of the lxx. is as little to the Purpose as the two former. For in being directed to say, *Peace be to this House* they entred into, they were to desire the God of Peace would bountifully bless with all good things, corporal, spiritual, and eternal, the whole Family that receiv'd their Persons and Doctrine. But what is this Infant-baptism?

As to the IV. The Child that Christ set in the midst of his Apostles, Mark ix. 36. doth not appear to have been young, as not to be capable of understanding what he heard, as shall be shewn when I come to his VI. Instance. Besides, the receiving such Children in Christ's Name is generally understood of those, who, as to some Qualifications, are like Children, viz. actual Believers, *Matt. xviii. 6*. And whereas he applies the Words of our Saviour, *Matt. xviii. 14.* to the Infants of Believers in general, if it were granted him, that these Words intend the Care of God over new-born Children; (which

he that considers the preceding Verses will hardly
yet that God willeth the Deliverance of all such Chil-
ren of Believers from Perdition, and not likewise some
of those of Unbelievers, will be hard to prove; nor can
any Argument be fetch'd from thence for admitting the
former to Baptism, and excluding the latter. His uncha-
stable Question therefore, *Whether rejecting them be not
rejecting Christ?* equally recoils on his own Practice.

The V. Instance, concerning *Zaccheus*, I have suffici-
ently spoke to already in the preceding Chapter. And
whether *Zaccheus* was a Jew, as some think, and is there-
fore call'd here a Son of Abraham; or, whether this is to
be understood as he was a sincere Convert, to which
latter Opinion I rather incline; 'tis equally foreign to
the matter in hand.

His VI. is built upon *Mark x. 13, 14, 15, 16. Matt. xix.
13, 14, 15. Luke xviii. 15, 16, 17.* Where he tells us;
*There was a special Occasion offer'd to our Lord to speak his
Mind very plainly concerning the Children of the Church:*
and adds; *They all three shew, that Christ commanded to
suffer little Children to come to him, and forbid them not;
giving this Reason; For of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.*
These Texts being often produc'd in defence of Pedobap-
tism, I shall endeavour somewhat more distinctly to shew
that they afford no Countenance to it.

And (1.) The Word *παιδία* in the two former Places,
and *βρέφον* in the last, (the former of which our Tran-
slation renders *young Children*, and *little Children*, and
the latter *Infants*) are observ'd by Interpreters to signify
sometimes those of a more grown Age. So *Grotius*, up-
on the above mention'd Place in *Matthew*, as he is cited
by *Mr. Poole* in his *Syn. Crit.* *Hæc vox παιδία de paulo
provetiore atate interdum accipitur; sic & βρέφος vox, ut
liquet, 2 Tim. iii. 15. i. e. This Word παιδία sometimes
denotes a more grown Age; so also doth the Word βρέφος,
as is clear from 2 Tim. iii. 15. And upon Luke xviii. 15.
Neque vox βρέφον, neque illud, quod apud Marcum est,
ἐναγκαλισάμενος, satis valide probant de Infantibus hic agi.
i. e. Neither the Word βρέφον, nor that in Mark, ἐναγκα-
λισάμενος, is a sufficient Proof that Infants are here treated of.*
As for the Participle *ἐναγκαλισάμενος* (which our Tran-
slators in *Mark ix. 36. render, took in his Arms, and Chap.*

x. 16. took up in his Arms) Grotius on the former place says; *Non male vertitur amplectens. Neque enim erat parvus Infans, ut ulnis gestandus esset, quippe qui vocatus Christo accurrerit, ut ex Matt. discimus. Imo Christus puerum juxta se constituit, Luc. ix. 47. i. e. 'Tis not ill render'd imbracing. Nor was it so small an Infant as to be carried in the Arms, since being call'd by Christ, it run to him, as we learn from Matthew. Nay, Christ set the Child by him, Luke ix. 47. But (2.) If they were Infants, there is nothing in any of these Passages to assure us that their Parents were Believers, and therefore no Privilege that Believers Children enjoy above others can be prov'd from them. Nor do we know who brought them, whether their Parents, or others. The most therefore that can be infer'd from this Act is, that those Persons were perswaded that Christ was a Prophet; which many were convinc'd of who never depended on him as the *Messiah*, and only Saviour, for Righteousness and Life. (3.) It plainly appears from hence, that altho' John the Baptist, and our Lord, by the Hands of his Disciples, had baptiz'd many adult Persons, John iv. 1, 2. before this time, yet such young Children as these had never been baptiz'd by them; yea, that the Disciples had never heard from the Mouth of our Lord, that they ever should be. For, had it been usual to bring Children to John and Christ for that end, it could never have seem'd strange to the Disciples that these should be brought to him, nor would they have presum'd to forbid them to obey the known Commands of their Lord. And here being so fit an *Occasion offer'd to our Lord*, to have declar'd his Pleasure concerning their Admission to Baptism, if he had design'd it; his not giving the least Intimation thereof, so far as appears by all the *Evangelists*, makes the Consequence much more natural, that 'tis not his Will they should be baptiz'd, than the contrary, as Mr. H. would infer.*

As for the Words, by some so much insisted on, that *of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*, whatsoever the Sense of them be, unless we were inform'd that these were the Children of believing Parents, which, as I said before, none of the *Evangelists* affirm, they can prove nothing. For, if we should (as Mr. H. would perswade us) understand the Gospel Church by the *Kingdom of Heaven*, it would

no way favour his Cause; for the Pedobaptists deny the greatest part of Infants a Right of Admission into it; and those, whose Right they plead for, they allow only the empty Name without the thing. And it seems very strange to me how our *Congregational* Brethren, who require an express Covenanting of those they receive into Fellowship with them, can pretend to own the Church-membership of Infants, whom they know to be incapable of this. And taking the word *such*, by way of Proportion or similitude, to signify those who in Humility, freedom from Malice, &c. are become like Children; should we expound the *Kingdom of Heaven*, to mean the Church of Christ on earth, this Explication will be still wider from the Purpose. But I rather suppose by the *Kingdom of Heaven* here, the Kingdom of Glory is intended. And should any say, young Infants have a Right to Heaven, it is unreasonable to deny them a Right to Baptism; I need only reply, it is equally unreasonable to deny them Communion with the Church Militant in the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper, who have a Right to Communion with the Church triumphant in Service more sublime and spiritual.

His Endeavour to expose those, who deny that Infants are capable to have the Seeds and Principles of Grace infus'd to them, no way concerns me; for I grant the Omnipotent God can work Grace in them when he pleases; yet I fear not to assert that Gospel Ministers, by the Commission of Christ, and Practice of his Apostles, are directed to expect a Discovery that he hath so done, before they admit them to Baptism. And they are certainly not included into all the Seed of Believers; nor is it possible to know which of them in particular partake of it, till they make a Profession of Faith, and therefore it can be no Warrent, from some of them partaking of such latent Habits, to baptize them all. And why may not some Children Unbelievers be renew'd by the Spirit of God in Infancy, which notwithstanding is not alleg'd as a Reason for their admission to Baptism?

What he tells us p. 52. That Infants are held forth by Christ as Patterns in receiving Grace, and that this proves Infants the best part of the Church, &c. need not long be insisted on. 'twill be own'd, that all Infants of Believers do not any time, much less in Infancy, receive Grace. And our ed doth not make them in receiving Grace, Patterns to

others in receiving the same; but speaks of such Qualifications, which, by reason of their Age, are inherent in and common to the Children of Believers with those of Unbelievers. Besides, how any one can assert that Infants are *the purest part of the Church*, who owns them to be born in original Sin, unless he will assert they are all sanctify'd by the Spirit of God, I am not able to discern. That they have not contracted equal Guilt with the adults by actual Transgression, nor are alike harden'd in the way of Sin with old Sinners, who have been accustom'd to do Evil, I readily grant; but that they may justly be affirm'd to be *purer*, whilst unregenerate, than truly sanctify'd Souls, as all Church-members ought to be, he would do well to prove.

But he proceeds to object against himself, *That Christ has not command these Children, that were brought to him, to be baptiz'd.* To this he answers, *That we do not read Christ commanded the grown Persons that brought them to be baptiz'd.* Perhaps they and their Children too were baptiz'd before. He must have a very mean Opinion of his Readers who thinks to impose upon them with such trifling Conjectures, and a bare *perhaps* in a matter of this Importance. And I have a little before shewn, that 'tis more probable from this place, that Infants had not till then been brought to Christ on any account, much less to be baptiz'd.

He goes on to tell us, *That altho' there is nothing said here of the baptizing of these Infants, yet our Lord declares them to be such Persons that other Scriptures shew to be baptiz'd.* And for the Proof of this he attempts to bring several Arguments.

The Persons, who by the Direction of God's Word have a Right to Baptism, are such who *confess their Sins* Matt. iii. 6. who by preaching are *made Disciples*, John iv. 1. Matt. xxviii. 19. who make Profession of Faith, and gladly receive the Word, Mark xvi. 16. Acts ii. 41. v. 12, 37, 38. xviii. 8, &c. Let us see therefore if any of these Characters are given by Christ to these Children.

I. They are said to come to Christ. And he adds; *For Believers bringing their Children to Christ, is esteem'd all the same as if the Children themselves came.* I am oblig'd to repeat here, tho' unwillingly, what I have said already touching this matter, that it don't certainly appear the Parents of the Children

Children were Believers, or that they were brought by them. And 'tis only a corporal approaching to Christ's bodily Presence that is here mention'd, and not a coming by Baptism. Nor does our not being satisfy'd to admit them to that Ordinance, hinder their coming to Christ by Faith, tho' we should be glad to bring them to him, as far as lies in our Power, in any way of his own Institution. But let Believers Children take heed of resting secure, on account of their Parents bringing them to Baptism, without coming actually themselves to Christ by Faith; for, whatever Mr. H. says of it's being *all one*, there will certainly be found a vast difference between them.

II. *Our Lord approv'd the pious Act, but was much dissatisfy'd with his own Disciples for opposing it.* But what is this to the discriminating Characters of those who are the proper Subjects of Baptism? I have shewn already in what sense they were brought to our Saviour.

III. *The King himself declares them to be of his Kingdom.* This has been explain'd before.

IV. *Our Blessed Lord doth not limit his Command to those Children then present, but upon the occasion of these, declares the Privilege of all the Infants of Believers.* He will do well to tell us what this Privilege is, for till it be prov'd Christ commanded those Children to be baptized, the Antipedobaptists will never be perswaded 'tis a Right to Baptism.

V. *They receiv'd Imposition of Hands, an outward Sign of Grace, and were blessed by Christ.* And he adds; *Christ's Blessing comprehends the Communication of all Grace, and good things to the Persons blessed by him.* And doth this Book, says he, as if Christ's Heart was set against them, to turn them out of his Church? What! is Imposition of Hands a Ceremony of Excommunication? What he understands here by Imposition of Hands being an outward Sign of Grace, I know not; whether that those Children had before partook of Grace, and that Christ laid his Hands on them as a declarative Sign of the Grace before receiv'd; or, that he did it to signify what he would then confer upon them. If the former, we know all the Infants of Believers do not, first or last, partake of saving Grace. And if these Children were indeed truly Gracious, our Lord, who knows the Hearts of Young and Old, was not ignorant

rant of it. But this can afford no Warrant or Direction to his Ministers to account all the Offspring of Believers so, and to administer an Ordinance to them all, without distinction. And if he should mean the latter, I do not find that he pretends *Ministers* ought to lay hands on them for that End, or that they can by Baptism confer Grace upon them. Our Opinion no more supposes that *the Heart of Christ is set against Children*, than his Nor does it give the least Shadow of Reason for such a Question, Whether Christ *excommunicated Infants* by laying his Hands on them. If they are born Church-members, they so remain, tho' not baptiz'd; as the Females, tho' uncircumcis'd, under the Law; if not, Baptism alone maketh none Church-members. But all his Exclamations against us for denying Infants Church-membership, the Practice of our Congregational Brethren, who no more admit them to it than we, shews to be merely *Vox & præterea nihil, Nothing but Noise*. And except he could pretend to convey a Right to his Children by being a Member himself of any particular Church, he, of any Man, might hold his Peace, and forbear censuring others for not allowing them that Name. But he goes on,

VI. *Christ holds them forth as Patterns of Grace to all grown Persons.* This has been answered already.

VII. *Another fit Occasion was offered to our Blessed Jesus to speak his Mind about Children, just before his last Sufferings.* The Children of Zion were joyful in their King, *Psal. clix. 2. Crying Hosanna to the Son of David*, Mat. xxi. 9, 15, 16. *Had there been such a thing as an Anabaptist then in being, might not he have soon quenched their Zeal, with these or the like Words to them? Alas, poor Children! ye have little reason thus to rejoice at the coming of your King; you have more need to weep and lament that he is come so soon; for ye will be great Losers, and will be set farther off from God by his coming, &c.* How far from the matter this Instance is, every Reader may discern at first View. His Task was to prove, that Infants have a Right to Baptism, and surely the Children who cried in the Temple, *Hosanna to the Son of David*, were not such, but arrived to Years capable of making some discovery of Grace, and a Profession of Faith, and to these we don't deny a Right to this Ordinance. Nor does the Word *υιοι*, Sons,

used

An Answer to Mr. H's Seventh Chapter. 101

ed by the Septuagint, or *παῖδες*, Children, by St. Matthew, determine the Age, both of them being used to signify *own Persons*, as well as *young Children*. And because he is thought fit here to introduce the Word *Anabaptist* by way of Reproach, and would insinuate as if there was no such thing then in being, as Persons of their Sentiments whom he calls by that Name; I must tell him, 'twill be past his Skill to prove there was any such thing as a Pedobaptist in being at that time. I shall only add, that we are as willing as he to encourage our Children to render due Honour to Christ, and I think I have already shewn, that our Opinion owns our Advantage by him to be as great as his.

C H A P. VII.

An Answer to Mr. H's Seventh Chapter.

MR. H. as we have observed, began his preceding Chapter with a very odd kind of *Objection*, concerning *Christ's turning Infants out of doors*. To which there answers, *If they were turned out, it must be either by Christ himself, or by his Apostles*. And we have in our Reply that Chapter considered what he there advances, to prove it was not done by Christ himself. His Task therefore in this VII Chapter will be, to shew they were not excluded by the Apostles, which he thus begins: *Altho' Christ did not do it in Person, yet he might give his Apostles Commission to turn out the Children, for which there is much said to no purpose, from Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. which they say was the Apostles Commission to disciple, and to baptize those whom they disciplined*. How Baptism maketh none Church-members, neither doth Church-membership convey a Right to Baptism, since according to the primitive Pattern all were baptized before their Reception into the Church. Whence it may appear at our Opinion, in not owning their Right to Baptism, no more turns them out of the Church, than his. And if Christ's Commission, recorded *Mat. xxviii. 19, 20. Mar. i. 15, 16.* gives his Ministers no Authority and Direction to baptize Infants, it must follow they have none from him to do, unless they can shew some other Commission for

that end. But altho' the Apostles, at Christ's Command baptiz'd such *Jews* before, who by teaching were made *Disciples*, *John* iv. 1. yet neither they, nor any other Ministers, have any Commission but this to baptize, since the Death of Christ. And there being no account in holy Scripture, that the Apostles after Christ's Death practis'd the baptizing of any, but professing Believers, there is no more Warrant to baptize Infants, than adult Persons who make no Profession; and our Brethren own the Commission excludes the latter.

His Insinuation, that the denying the Interest of Believers Children, as such, in the Covenant of Grace, is a new Gospel, may appear, from what is before prov'd, to be not only most *uncharitable*, but utterly untrue. And as to the Question, *Must they teach, that the Covenant and Promise thereof, as running to Believers and their Seed, was repealed* it may suffice to answer, that if by *Covenant*, he mean the Promise established of God in Christ before the Law was given at *Sinai*, this never run from Parents to Children, in the Sense he contends for; but if he intend the Mount *Sinai* Covenant, that is repealed, *Heb.* viii. ult. But he attempts to prove a *Command*, in *Mat.* xxviii. 20. *to baptize Infants* where our Lord requires his Ministers to teach their Disciples *all things whatsoever he had commanded*; alleging that *one thing Christ had commanded them was, to suffer little Children to come to him, and forbid them not.* If that will content him, we are willing, not only, not to hinder their coming to Christ, but to pray for it, to further and encourage what we can. But that this proves nothing in reference to the Point in Controversy, but rather affords us reason to conclude our Lord never gave them any Command for the Practice, hath been shewn already.

What he says, *p.* 58. concerning the Reception of Profelytes is spoke to before. And his Assertion, *That when Christ said, Go Disciple all Nations, they must needs understand of such as were Disciples before,* meaning Children, cannot stand him in no stead, the Children of Profelytes, or others being no where called *Disciples* in the Old or New Testament. The Weakness of what he says about *discipling Houses* from *Luke* xix. 9. and of the *Apostles discipling and baptizing Houses*, as such, hath likewise been already discovered.

But now we are called upon to observe the Apostles Commission explain'd by their preaching through the Acts. And

is I shall readily follow him, being content the Cause in debate may be decided by the Exposition which the Apostles Teaching and Practice, as recorded there, give of it. This first and chief Instance, to prove Infants Baptism to be intended in their Commission, from their Preaching, is Acts ii. 39. *The Promise is to you and to your Children.* And here, if it was granted him, that *God's Covenant with Abraham* for his spiritual Seed, is intended by the Promise, wherein Pardon of Sin, a new Heart, and Perseverance, &c. are ensured to them, the Antipedobaptists would not be touched (as he says they are) by this Text. Nor can I think any of them so inconsiderate as to say, *The Promise is urg'd as a Condition of Repentance*, &c. tho' some may affirm Repentance to be the Condition of the Promise; by which if they mean no more than that none without Repentance can be known by us to have an Interest in it, and that it is here made only to true Penitents, I agree with them. Nor can he say of any one in particular, that this or that Infant hath, or shall have Repentance unto Life granted it; and therefore can have no fair Pretence to deduce the Right of any of them to that Ordinance, for the Administration of which a Profession of that Grace is here prerequired. But further to shew that this Text affords no Countenance to his Cause, let a few things be well considered.

1. Neither *Jews* nor Proselytes, who were the Apostle's Auditors, were actual Believers, at least not then known to be such, when this mention of the Promise was made to them. Nay they were such who had taken, and by wicked Hands crucify'd and slain the Lord of Life, Ver. 23. and thereby the chiefest of Sinners, and antecedently to this Gospel-call, only under Consternation and Dread, on account of the greatness of their Sins, which then they were convinc'd of. And I hope he will not assert that these Murderers of the Holy *Jesus* were actually interested in the New Covenant, before Repentance and Faith in Christ were given to them.

2. The Apostle says nothing in this Sermon, to assure us that he had the least respect to Infants. The term *Children* will no more prove those here intended by him to be Infants, than that the Armies of *Israel*, which fought all those Battles against the *Canaanites*, were composed of such, because they are called the *Children of Israel*. But as they had in a direful manner imprecated that the Blood of Christ

might be on them and their *Children*, meaning their *Posterity*, (which Curse is not removed from the Body of that People to this Day) so he here declares to these his awakened Auditors, that Pardon, on *Repentance* and Subjection to the Blessed *Jesus*, should be given to *them*, and *their Posterity*. As there is no ground to question, but many of the Children of the *Jews* and *Profelytes*, who attended on this Sermon, were adult, it may reasonably be expected that either he assert those Adult Children, whose Parents were Believers, had an immediate Right to the Promise on the Parents imbracing it by Faith, or else own, that all he has said from this *Text* is wholly groundless. For the Apostle asserts not the Promise to be to their Children newly born, on any other terms, than to those who were come to Years of Understanding.

3. The Apostle declares the Promise to extend to all those, and those only, whom *the Lord should call*, Ver. 39. And when any, from whomsoever descended, appear to have been effectually called, we readily own their Interest in the Promise, and Right to Baptism.

4. The Practice of the Apostles best explains their Words; and of all who were baptiz'd, it is said, Ver 41. that they *gladly received the Word*. Which, I suppose, he will not say, relates to such Children, for whose Right to Baptism he contends. These Considerations may be sufficient to shew the Invalidity of what he urges from this *Text*, and that the Emphasis he would lay upon the Words, *the Promise*, can do him no service.

When he says, p. 60. *The Apostles hold forth one and the same Promise equally and alike to both Jews and Profelytes, and to the Children of each*; he hath writ more Truth than I suppose he was aware of. For, if the Promise be *equally and alike held forth* to the Parents and Children, then a *Profession of Faith and Repentance* is necessary to Children, as well as Parents, before any Sign of Covenant-interest may be affixed to either.

He goes on to tell us, that *as the Apostles in preaching to the Church of Israel, did comprehend the Children with their Parents under one and the same Promise, so also they did make the usual Distribution of the World into two Parts, Nigh and Afir off*. And what those Terms import, he bids us see in *I ph. 11*. Which place we shall afterwards consider in this Chapter. But now follow *three Things*, which he would have duly considered.

I. If

I. *If the Apostles had turned the Children out, would the believing Jews, who made such a stir to have their Children circumcised, and who were so angry with Paul, upon a Rumour that he forbade it, Acts xxi. 20, 21. would they all be content and quiet, when they should see all their poor Infants turned out of the visible Church, &c?*

Their pleading for their Circumcision proves rather they were not then baptiz'd. And seeing they were indulged in circumcizing their Children, during the time that the holy Scriptures give us an account of the Apostles Acts, and Establishment in the World, as well as in other Jewish Ordinances, virtually abolished by the Death of Christ, 'tis no wonder if we hear of no Complaints against them, on that point. But I shall have occasion to say more of this afterwards, in Chap. IX. and therefore shall only add here, that seems to me more unaccountable when so many thousand were baptized, that Men and Women should be expressly recorded, as in Acts viii. 12. and not so much as one Infant Child, incapable of making a Profession of Faith; since the Design of the Scripture is not so much to tell us what we could not do, as what we should, in Divine Worship.

II. *The unbelieving Jews on all Occasions were quarrelling with Christ and his Apostles, and against the Christian Faith, because the Types and Ceremonies of Moses's Law, the Holiness of the Temple, &c. were discontinued. But read the Evangelists and Acts, there is not a Word against them for discontinuing Childrens Church-membership.*

I have read the Evangelists and Acts many times over, and don't find what he so positively affirms, of the unbelieving Jews quarrelling with Christ and his Apostles for discontinuing the Mosaic Ceremonies. And I always thought they continued in force till the Death of our Saviour; and we read that the Apostles (as hath been but now observ'd) in consideration of the Weakness of the Jews, who pertinaciously adher'd to them, even afterwards allowed their Observation of them; and the Complaint against Paul, Acts xxi. was wholly malicious, and in a great part, if not altogether false.

III. *The Children were Losers, and set farther off from God by Christ's Suffering, if they were not in the visible Church, and in Covenant afterwards, as they were before.*

I shall afterwards shew they were great Gainers by Christ's coming, altho' they are not Members of the Gospel Church; and

might be on them and their *Children*, meaning their *Posterity*, (which Curse is not removed from the Body of that People to this Day) so he here declares to these his awakened Auditors, that Pardon, on *Repentance* and Subjection to the Blessed *Jesus*, should be given to *them*, and *their Posterity*. As there is no ground to question, but many of the Children of the *Jews* and *Profelytes*, who attended on this Sermon, were adult, it may reasonably be expected that either he assert those Adult Children, whose Parents were Believers, had an immediate Right to the Promise on the Parents imbracing it by Faith, or else own, that all he has said from this *Text* is wholly groundless. For the Apostle asserts not the Promise to be to their Children newly born, on any other terms, than to those who were come to Years of Understanding.

3. The Apostle declares the Promise to extend to all those, and those only, whom *the Lord should call*, Ver. 39. And when any, from whomsoever descended, appear to have been effectually called, we readily own their Interest in the Promise, and Right to Baptism.

4. The Practice of the Apostles best explains their Words; and of all who were baptiz'd, it is said, Ver 41. that they *gladly received the Word*. Which, I suppose, he will not say, relates to such Children, for whose Right to Baptism he contends. These Considerations may be sufficient to shew the Invalidity of what he urges from this Text, and that the Emphasis he would lay upon the Words, *the Promise*, can do him no service.

When he says, p. 60. *The Apostles hold forth one and the same Promise equally and alike to both Jews and Profelytes, and to the Children of each*; he hath writ more Truth than I suppose he was aware of. For, if the Promise be *equally and alike held forth* to the Parents and Children, then a *Profession of Faith* and *Repentance* is necessary to Children, as well as Parents, before any Sign of Covenant-interest may be affixed to either.

He goes on to tell us, that as the Apostles in preaching to the Church of Israel, did comprehend the Children with their Parents under one and the same Promise, so also they did make the usual Distribution of the World into two Parts, Nigh and Afar off. And what those Terms import, he bids us see in *I ph. 11*. Which place we shall afterwards consider in this Chapter. But now follow three Things, which he would have duly considered.

I. If

I. If the Apostles had turned the Children out, would the unbelieving Jews, who made such a stir to have their Children circumcised, and who were so angry with Paul, upon a Rumour that he forbid it, Acts xxi. 20, 21. would they all be content and quiet, when they should see all their poor Infants turned out of the visible Church, &c?

Their pleading for their Circumcision proves rather they were not then baptiz'd. And seeing they were indulged in circumcizing their Children, during the time that the holy scriptures give us an account of the Apostles Acts, and Entertainment in the World, as well as in other Jewish Ordinances, virtually abolished by the Death of Christ, 'tis no wonder if we hear of no Complaints against them, on that account. But I shall have occasion to say more of this afterwards, in Chap. IX. and therefore shall only add here, that seems to me more unaccountable when so many thousand were baptized, that Men and Women should be expressly recorded, as in Acts viii. 12. and not so much as one Infant Child, incapable of making a Profession of Faith; since the Design of the Scripture is not so much to tell us what we could not do, as what we should, in Divine Worship.

II. The unbelieving Jews on all Occasions were quarrelling with Christ and his Apostles, and against the Christian Faith, because the Types and Ceremonies of Moses's Law, the Holiness of the Temple, &c. were discontinued. But read the Evangelists and Acts, there is not a Word against them for discontinuing Childrens Church-membership.

I have read the Evangelists and Acts many times over, and don't find what he so positively affirms, of the unbelieving Jews quarrelling with Christ and his Apostles for discontinuing the Mosaic Ceremonies. And I always thought they continued in force till the Death of our Saviour; and we find that the Apostles (as hath been but now observ'd) in condescension to the Weakness of the Jews, who pertinaciously adher'd to them, even afterwards allowed their Observation of them; and the Complaint against Paul, Acts xxi. was wholly malicious, and in a great part, if not altogether false.

III. The Children were Losers, and set farther off from God by Christ's Suffering, if they were not in the visible Church, and in Covenant afterwards, as they were before.

I shall afterwards shew they were great Gainers by Christ's coming, altho' they are not Members of the Gospel Church; and

106 *An Answer to Mr. H's Seventh Chapter.*

and may add, Members of any Church of a like Constitution they never had been, and interested, as such, in the Covenant of Grace they never were; tho' Mr. H. after his usual manner, boldly enough, tells us, *they were in that Morning, that those 3000 heard that Sermon and were converted*; when in truth, the Jewish Church-state, and Covenant with the carnal Seed, were abolished by Christ at his Death, about seven Weeks before the preaching of that Sermon. And does he think the empty Name of Church-membership, would have weighed any thing with these new Converts, who had been thoroughly convinc'd of Sin, and with so much Joy received the glad tidings of Pardon for themselves and theirs, upon Repentance?

But to prove further, *that the Apostle here by the Promise intended the Covenant of Promise made with Abraham*, he compares this place with Chap. iii. 13, 19, 25. and from the joint Consideration of them advances the following Propositions.

1. *That which he calls the Promise in one Sermon, he calls the Covenant which God made with their Fathers in the other, even with Abraham, &c.*

2. *Those who are the Children of the Covenant, the Promise or Covenant, is to them and their Children, even now.*

3. *This Promise, as running to them and their Children, to be preached as a Motive to Repentance, &c.*

4. *This Preaching was abundantly blessed of God, and made effectual to many thousands of them, both Jews and Proselytes.*

5. *Baptism, the new Sign, is annexed to this antient Promise. Be baptized, &c.*

6. *In both these places the Apostle gives a hint of the calling the Gentiles into Abraham's Covenant, and the Privileges thereof.*

I have already shewn in what Sense Peter preached the Promise mentioned Acts ii. 39. which nothing offered in any of these Propositions does in the least enervate; but on the contrary what he says in Chap. iii. will be found very consistent with it, if we consider these few things (1.) The Sins Peter charges upon them, Chap. iii. ver. 14, 15. fully evince that they had, all the time of Christ's own personal Ministry, rejected, when grown up, the Grace and Duties of the Covenant; which he owns would exclude them from the Privileges of it. (2.) Repentance and Conversion

son, *Ver. 19.* are required as necessary to their actual Reception of the Pardon of Sin, one great Blessing of the Covenant of Grace, and the *Gentiles* themselves were to partake of it upon Repentance. (3.) Their being called the *Children of the Covenant*, *Ver. 25.* cannot intend their actual Interest in the Promises of the Covenant whilst Unbelievers; but their Descent from them, with whom that Covenant was established, and who by God's appointment had a Right to the first Publication of the Grace of it, as *Luke xxiv. 47.* For when the Apostle began his Sermon, as well those converted by it, as those who were not, were all in a State of Impenitency and Unbelief, the former at that time no more partaking of the great Promises of the Covenant, Faith, Pardon, and Sanctification, than the latter.

He proceeds, *pag. 64.* to raise an *Objection*, That the Promise, as to those afar off, is limited to those of them only, whom the Lord should call, *Acts ii. 39.* But to this he answers nothing new, except where he tells us, from *Acts iii. 25.* compared with *Gen. xxii. 18.* & *xii. 3.* that the Gospel was to be carried on in the way of Families, or Fatherhoods, in all Nations; which Families, or Fatherhoods, are called *Kindreds*. From whence he infers, Those who would exclude the Infants of the Faithful, ought to prove they are not a kin to their own Parents. But then according to this Interpretation, many more, besides Children, would be intitled to Church-membership and Baptism, most believing Parents having many that are a kin to them, besides their own Children. Yea all Mankind are a kin each to other. For, God hath made of one Blood all Nations of Men, *Acts xvii. 26.* 'Tis true Children are more near a kin than most others; but then Husband and Wife are, at least, as nearly related as Parents and Children. Yet I know of none who assert the Faith of the believing Husband, or Wife, to give a Right of Admission to these Privileges to the Unbeliever, tho' they both make one Flesh. But let us hear Mr. Pool's Sense of *Gen. xii. 3.* "By all Families of the Earth (says he) all Nations are intended. And he adds; "Which is to be limited to the Believers of all Nations, by the whole Current of the Scriptures.

But he goes on to a second Argument, from *Acts ii. 47.* The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved. Whence he infers; Therefore the Infants of his People were added to the Church with their Parents. To deny this is to say, that

108 *An Answer to Mr. H's Seventh Chapter.*

that the Lord will not save them if they die Infants.

There can be no Strength in this, unless it had been said, *every one that should be saved was added to the Church.* And had it been so exprest, as 'tis not, it might well have been understood to relate only to such, of whom, by God's Appointment, the Gospel Church was to consist. As to the Salvation of those who die Infants, enough hath been spoken already, in *Chap. II.*

We are told in the *third* place, that in *Acts vii.* we find Stephen preaching the Covenant of God with Abraham, but saith nothing of its being repealed, changed, &c. Ver. 5, 7, 8, 32, 34.

If it be so, it is nothing but what we endeavour to do ourselves, that is, to preach the Covenant established with him for his spiritual Seed. But those Words he directs us to are as little to his purpose as any he could have pitched upon, being only an historical Narration of the former Transactions of God with Abraham, and of the Idolatry of the *Israelites*.

We are directed in the *fourth* place to *Acts xiii. 32, 33, 42, 43, &c.* to learn the Continuance of Infants Covenant-interest and Church-membership; and the proof thence taken is, *That Paul calls both Jews and Profelytes the Children of the Fathers, to whom the Promise was made, and preached the Covenant of Abraham with great Success to the Gentiles, as well as Jews and Profelytes.*

That he calls the *Profelytes the Children of the Fathers*, needs better proof, altho' some of them, to whom he spake, were so; it being no unusual thing to give such Appellations to an Auditory, that belong only to the greater part; but if they were intended by him, it must be that he accounted them his spiritual Children; for his carnal Seed they were not. And when any appear to be the spiritual Children of Abraham, we are as willing as he can desire, to own their Interest in the Covenant of Grace, and Right to Membership in the Gospel Church. But 'tis no pleasant Task to follow him in things so very remote from the point in Controversy.

But he tells us, *The Covenant of Abraham, which comprehends the Offspring with the Parents, is still continued to us Gentiles, being one of those Gifts of God of which he never repented.* That the Doctrine of the Covenant of Grace, which the Lord so transacted with Abraham, as to grant him

him that Privilege and Prerogative, which no Believers in- by besides him, to stand in a paternal Relation to all who should believe in after Ages, is yet continu'd to the *Gentiles*, where the Gospel is preached, is readily granted; but that God doth so establish the Covenant of Grace with ordinary believing Parents, as that their Offspring, as such, are by their Faith interested in it, is what ought to be proved; and without this he only beats the Air, and talks to no purpose.

He brings a *fifth* Instance from *Acts* xvi. 14, 15. where *Lydia* saith, *If you have judged me to be faithful to the Lord.* by which Words he supposeth she pleads her Faithfulness with respect to Abraham's Covenant, in having her Household baptiz'd, as soon as she was baptiz'd her self: and asks whether can be thought that they would have baptiz'd her in her own Person, if they had not judged her to have Faith?

I never understood before, that God, in transacting his Covenant with *Abraham*, required the Baptism of any, either young or old; and must own my self unable to discern the force of the Reason he assigns for his Conjecture. For seeing he pleads only for the Baptism of Believers Children, they would no more have baptiz'd her Children, if she had any, than her self, unless they had judg'd her to have Faith, and Infants Baptism been a Duty. But we have another reason given us for this Notion; and that is, because the people of God were not to come in and abide, and so have Communion with any *Gentiles*, as Saints, till such Persons, and their kindred, received the Token of the Covenant, *Gen. xvii. Exod. xii.* To which I answer, (1.) *Lydia* appears to have been a *Pro-lyte*, and it is likely her Males, if she had any, were circumcised. But (2.) *Paul* well understood that the middle Wall of Partition between *Jews* and *Gentiles* was broken down, and that now it was not unlawful for him to go into *Lydia's* House, altho' neither she nor her Household had been baptiz'd. (3.) I have shewn already in *Chap. V.* that there is much more reason to suppose she had no Children; where the following Instance of the *Jailer's* Household has likewise been considered; and therefore I shall not burden the Reader with unnecessary Repetitions.

But in the same Page 67. we meet with another unusual Hint; That the Apostles, in preaching to *Jews* and *Pro-lytes*, say, *The Promise is to you, and to your Children, and ye are the Children of the Covenant*; but to the *Gentiles*,

tiles, the Tense is chang'd; Believe, and thou shalt be sav'd, and thy House. And he adds; If it be objected, that many Preachers now observe no such Distinction in their Preaching, my Answer is, Let that Practice of theirs shift for it self as well as it can; I see not how it can be justify'd.

Observe who they are to whom the Apostle says, *The Promise is to you, &c.* They are *Jews and Profelytes*, guilty of the highest Crimes. Yet these, if we may believe him, were interested in the Promise, and in a State of Salvation, before they repented, and gladly receiv'd the Word, but the *Gentiles* were not; otherwise there could be no pretence for making such a Distinction, as he alleges, between them and the *Gentiles*. Wherefore, according to his reasoning, there was no occasion for *Peter* to have preach'd *Repentance*, as prerequir'd to Baptism in those adult, since being in Covenant, they had by that means a Right to it. And if such as these were in Covenant, and so esteem'd by the Apostles, before they repented, as he must suppose; I would fain know what degree of Sin will deprive one descended from believing Parents, of that Interest in the Covenant which he deriv'd from them. It seems he thinks betraying and murdering the holy and just One would not do it. When therefore may a Person look upon himself to have by *his own Act rejected the Grace or Duties of the Covenant*? Nor do I see how Ministers can now observe such a Distinction, unless they go among Heathens, who have not made any Profession of the true God. Surely, all the Inhabitants of these Nations, who profess Christ, look like the spiritual Children of *Abraham*, as those whom he would perswade us were visibly in Covenant, and in a State of Salvation before Repentance. And I doubt not but our Pedobaptist Brethren shew more Love and Care of the Souls of Men in their Preaching, than he has done in his Writing, by giving so great Incouragement to groundless and dangerous Presumptions, which corrupt Nature and a subtil Tempter are always but too apt to improve. And I perswade my self they will never follow his Direction tho' they lose the Advantage of such a Patron, he being resolv'd, it seems, if they do not, to leave them to shift for themselves.

In the seventh place, From *Christ's Command to search the Scriptures of the Old Testament*, John v. 39. and the Commendation of the Bereans for examining the Doctrine

An Answer to Mr. H's Seventh Chapter. 111.

Paul and Silas by them, Acts xvii. 10, 11, 12. he infers, That the Doctrine which would exclude Believers Infants, is not true, because it will not bear, but continually flies from the Test of the Scriptures written in the Old Testament. We are as desirous as possible that this Command of Christ may be obey'd, and the Example of the noble Bereans imitated; which, had it been carefully and diligently performed by him, would have freed us from a great deal of Trouble in this Treatise. The Scriptures of the Old Testament were no more design'd to instruct us in the Subjects of Gospel Ordinances, than what kind of Officers should administer them. If any should undertake to prove the several Ranks of Officers in Subordination to each other, constituted in some Churches, in Conformity to the legal Pattern, and argue against him and others, that the Apostles can't be suppos'd to have taught any such Doctrine, that there is no Order of Gospel Ministers superior to Presbyters, because that will not bear the Test of the Old Testament Writings; or that the Gospel Church should not be National, as the Legal was, for the same Reason; it is to be hop'd, I say, in such a case they would not be at a loss to shew the Invalidity of this way of Reasoning, which when they have done, we cannot but be furnish'd with a Reply to him. Moreover, I thought the typical Holiness of the Jews, by which they had a Right to Admission in that Church, had been design'd of God to signify the real Holiness which should be requir'd for that End in the Gospel Church; or, which is the same thing, that the carnal Seed had been Types of the spiritual. And we know, that which is born of the Flesh is Flesh, John iii. 6. and none derive Holiness from their Parents, but all equally stand in need of Regeneration. And as the same Qualifications that are necessary to render any meet for the Lord's Supper, are prerequisite to Baptism; so the Exclusion of Infants from the latter will as well bear the Test of all the Scriptures in the Old Testament, as from the former. Besides, the Doctrines preach'd by the Apostles, which were thus examin'd by the Scriptures, were such that respected the Person and Offices of the Messiah, and the Nature of that Redemption which was to be wrought for Sinners by him, with the means whereby it should be accomplish'd; and not the Ordinances he should appoint, or the Subjects of them. For they expected an Alteration in these, when the

the *Messiah* came, as may be gather'd from *John*, Chap. i. and Chap. iv. And when the *Bereans* were convinc'd that *Jesus* was the *Messiah*, they could no longer doubt his Authority to appoint all things relating to Worship, as best pleased him.

The *Promise made of God to the Fathers*, mention'd *Acts* xxvi. 6, 7. (which is his eighth instance) respects the Salvation purchased by Christ, and the Resurrection of the Body. Rare Proof of Infants Church-membership and Baptism! But we are directed also to the 22 *Verse* of the same *Chapter*, where *Paul* declares, *That he said none other things than those which the Prophets and Moses did say should come.* But the *Verse* next following would have told him what those Doctrines were, which were thus foretold by *Moses* and the *Prophets*, viz. *That Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the Dead, and should shew Light unto the People, and to the Gentiles.* The Apostle here declares, that there was no ground for them who believ'd *Moses* and the *Prophets*, to object against his Doctrine; for by them the chief Heads he insisted on were foretold, as the *Death and Resurrection of Christ*, and the preaching of the Gospel thro' him unto the *Gentiles*. As to what he pretends of *their foretelling that Children should not be turn'd out*, it has been answered already; and I shall only add, that 'tis not very agreeable to Sense, to talk so much of turning Children out of a Covenant which they were never in, and out of a Church, whereof they never were Members.

But he says, *The Church under the New Testament is built on the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets; for they laid not two Foundations, the Prophets one for the Jews, that would carry both adult, and Infants; and the Apostles another for the Gentiles, that would bear none but adult Persons.* The Church consider'd, as consisting of the true spiritual Seed, was both under the *Law* and *Gospel* built on Christ; the sure and only Foundation, and precious Corner-stone, which Foundation they might be said to lay Ministerially, 1 *Cor.* iii. 10. *Rom.* xv. 20. as they were appointed and enabled by God to publish Christ to be the only Foundation, and direct Sinners to apply themselves to him. *For other Foundation can no Man lay*, 1 *Cor.* iii. 11. And this Foundation is own'd by Antipedobaptists sufficient for all who are united to him, as the several parts of the Building

to its Foundation. But what this avails to the matter in Debate, I must confess I can't discern.

He proceeds to tell us, *If Believers Infants were not of the Number of God's Covenant People, &c. then were they of all Mankind most miserable, as partaking with the Church in all Ages, in her Sufferings*; and adds, *That they seem in particular manner to be the Objects of the Rage of Satan, and his Instruments.* Of this he gives us several Instances: *the Persecution of Isaac by Ishmael; the Command of Pharaoh to have the Children destroy'd; the Opposition he afterwards made against the Redemption of the Infant-seed, Exod. 10, 11. and the cruel Rage of the Enemy against Christ himself, when an Infant, and all the Children in Bethlehem, when two Years old, and under.*

He might have consider'd in his first Instance, that *Ishmael the Persecutor was the Son of believing Abraham, as well as persecuted Isaac.* But one plain Testimony of Holy Scripture would be of more weight with a Person seriously inquisitive after Truth, than a thousand such Sophisms as these. That Satan and his Instruments exerted their Rage against the Infant-seed of Believers on that account, it won't appear from the Examples produc'd by him, but for reasons of a far different Nature. If any one should undertake to prove the Covenant-interest, and Church-membership of the Children of Heathen, from the Lord's assigning this, as one Reason of his sparing the great City *Nineveh*, that there were therein *more than sixscore Thousand persons that could not discern between their Right hand and their Left*, I am perswaded he would deny this to be good proof that such have a Right to Baptism. And yet the favour of God to any (and not to them only, but to others for their sakes) must be, at least, as good an Argument for their Covenant-interest, &c. as the Malice of Satan against any can be supposed to be. By those Words, *If Believers Infants were not so privileged, they were of all Mankind most miserable*, he must suppose, that otherwise there is no hope of their eternal Happiness. But as it is certain God reneweth, and saveth all his Chosen ones among them, there is no reason to exclude any of them who are in Infancy, from that Number, unless the contrary had been reveal'd; and it seems very severe and unreasonable to conclude, that all the Children of Unbelievers, dying in Infancy, are damn'd.

But to perswade us Infants may be Members of the visible Church, he asks; *Was not our Lord Christ, when an Infant, not only a Member, but the Head of the Church? And did not our Blessed Saviour, by passing thro' the State of Childhood, sanctify that Estate to Children? Yea, Did not his lying in the Womb, sanctify that Estate also to Infants in the Womb?*

To this I need only return the following *Questions*, as our Saviour reply'd to the *Jews*, *Matth. xxi. 25.* (1.) Was not our Lord Christ Thousands of Years before his Conception, and lying in the Womb of the Virgin, the Head of the Church? (2.) Was it not the invisible Church, consisting only of the Elect, who were Members of that mystical Body, whereof Christ was then the Head? And is it not somewhat unaccountable to pretend, that the time of Christ's Headship over the invisible Church, should determine the time for the admission of any into the visible one? (3.) Are Children before they are born Church-members, and thereby intitled to Baptism, by Christ's sanctifying that Estate to them? This may with equal Reason be infer'd from his Words as that they are intitled to this Privilege as soon as they are born. (4.) Was it not a Church of a different Constitution from that of the Gospel, of which our Lord was a Member in Infancy? 'Till he answer these Queries, shall think it needless to return his a more direct Reply.

I have thus far accompanied Mr. *H.* in considering how the Apostles executed their Commission of Baptism, both in their Preaching and Practice, from what is recorded of them in their *Acts*, and find nothing either said or done there, to countenance the Application of that Ordinance to Infants.

I now proceed to the Consideration of his Argument from *Romans xi.* And it ought in the first place to be observ'd, that the Apostles Discourse in this Chapter whereon so much Stress is laid, is *Metaphorical*, three Similitudes being here us'd by him. And it is well known that *Metaphors* run not (as we say) on all four, and prove nothing beyond their chief Scope and Design. To this Purpose, Dr. *Owen* in his *Treatise of Perseverance*, p. 416 says, "Parables have their Bounds and Limits, their Line and Proportions, Scope, and peculiar Intendment, be

"yea

yond which they prove nothing at all. To wring the Nose of a Parable, or Similitude, to force it to an universal Compliance, will bring forth Blood. There is nothing so sottish, or foolish, or contradictory, in, and to it self, as may not be countenanc'd from teaching Parables to be Instructive, and proving in every Parcel, or Expression that attends them." Here then we ought in the first place to inquire what is the chief Scope and Intention of the Apostle in this *Chapter*, and regulate our Exposition by it. His chief Design therefore I take to have been this, To prevent the insulting of the *Gentiles* over the *Jews*, and the Despair of the latter, by asserting, and proving the general Call and Conversion of them in the latter Day. For, having before shewn, that the rejection of the *Jews* was not total, he here asserts, it should not be final; but that afterwards great Numbers of them should, thro' the Power and Grace of God, be brought over to acknowledge and believe in the Lord Jesus. And having declar'd *Verse 12, 15.* what an Advantage their conversion would be to the *Gentiles*, he advances this Argument, *Verse 16.* to prove the infallible Certainty of their future Conversion. *If the First-fruit be Holy, the Lump is also Holy; and if the Root be Holy, so are the Branches.* Which Prediction not having yet receiv'd its accomplishment, may afford us some Light into the meaning of these Words. I shall now briefly inquire what is intended by the *First-fruits* and *Lump*, and what by the *Root* and *Branches*; as also what that *Holiness* is which is here ascrib'd to them; and what is to be understood by the *good Olive-tree* afterwards mention'd.

If the *First-fruit* and the *Root* are the same, as some think, what is said of the latter must consequently be understood of the former. But if as others; with whom I agree, we make a difference between these two, then those *Jews* who were converted to the Faith of Christ in the primitive times, seem evidently to be intended by the *First-fruit*; and by the *Lump*, the Body of that People, which shall be converted in the latter Day, as *Verse 26.* *All Israel shall be saved*; whereby not a temporal Deliverance from Enemies, but eternal Salvation is, I suppose, intended. And the former may be call'd the *First-fruit*, as being but a few in comparison of the plentiful Harvest at the last Day; and as being a Pledge of the Conversion of the rest of God's

116 *An Answer to Mr. H's Seventh Chapter.*

Chosen ones among that People, in being first converted, as *Rom. xvi. 5.* *1 Cor. xvi. 15.* and chosen and separated by God's free Purpose of Grace in Eternity, and his effectual calling them in time, as our Apostle declares. *Verse 7.* *Israel* (that is, the natural Posterity of *Abraham* and *Jacob*) *hath not obtain'd that which he seeketh for, but the Election hath obtain'd it, &c.* And so, when he tells us of their Conversion at the latter Day, (when the *Lump* shall be brought in) *Verse 28.* he saith, *As touching the Election, they are belov'd for the Father's sake.* That is, God will then manifest and discover his Love in effectually calling them, and so accomplish the Promises made to their Fathers, of raising up a numerous spiritual Seed unto *Abraham*, both among *Jews* and *Gentiles*, that he shall not want any of them, to which, by God's Appointment he was to stand in the Relation of a Spiritual Father. And accordingly I take inherent *Holiness* to be intended in this place; for so were the *First fruits* inherently Holy, and shall the *Lump*; otherwise they would not, as *Verse 23.* *be all saved.* For without such an *Holiness* none shall be saved. *Heb. xii. 14.* And God hath chosen his that they may be Holy, *Eph. i. 4.* and hath elected them thro' sanctification of the Spirit unto Obedience, *1 Pet. i. 2.*

In Contradistinction from the *First-fruit* taken in this Sense, by the *Root* here; I conceive with our Pedobaptist Brethren, that *Abraham* is intended in the Relation of Covenant-head to his Seed, and the *Branches* to be this Seed of his. And I see no reason to question, but *Abraham* in this Chapter be represented as a *Root* in a double respect; as I think we have fully prov'd already that he stood as Covenant-head to a twofold Seed, natural, and spiritual. For here we have mention made of *natural Branches* whereby his natural Seed, as such, are evidently to be understood; and also of some that are *Branches* in him by Faith, which are his spiritual Seed. This *Text* therefore can avail nothing to the Purpose, for which it is so strenuously urged, unless it be prov'd that the natural Seed of Believers, as such, are the spiritual Seed of *Abraham*; or that every Believer stands related as a Root, or Covenant-head to his Seed, as *Abraham* to his; both which (I mistake not) have been already sufficiently disprov'd. Moreover, if the calling of God's Chosen ones among the *Jews* in the last Days, be infer'd from the Covenant

establish'd with *Abraham* in the latter Sense, as likewise the Elect among that People, which were the *First fruits* in the primitive times, and whom the Apostle, in *Verse 7*. mainly intends; then the carnal Seed of *Abraham* himself, much less of any others, can never be hence prov'd to partake of such an *Holiness* as gives Right to Baptism. But if it be their Relation to *Abraham*, as his fleshly Seed, by which this *Holiness* is deriv'd to them, and that a federal *Holiness* gives Right to Baptism, then all the *Jews* who have perish'd in Unbelief for more than 1600 Years, were federally Holy, and had such a Right, as well as those that shall be converted hereafter. Our *Annotators*, whom I have so often cited, were sensible, that if the *branches* be the natural Seed, (as they suppose) then an *Holiness*, which they say also is federal, is to be ascrib'd to the *Jews* at this Day. Their Words are these, in Answer to this *Question*; Of what *Holiness* doth the Apostle here speak? "It is not meant (say they) of inherent, but of federal, or Covenant holiness; all in an outward and visible Covenant with God, were call'd Holy. Many common things are call'd Holy in Scripture, because dedicated to God, and to his Service. Yea, *Jerusalem*, tho' a Place of great Wickedness, is call'd a *holy City*. In such a Sense as this, the *Jews* are still an *holy People*, they have an hereditary kind of Dedication to God; they have a federal *Holiness* and Relation to God, as being forever separated to him in the Loins of their Progenitors; this can never be wholly forfeited, as being granted to all the Posterity of the holy Patriarchs." But how this can agree with the Apostle's Argument, 'tis not easy to imagine, since the Consequence above mention'd must then necessarily follow. But if we understand it of *Abraham's* spiritual Seed among them, that is, those who are chosen of God in Christ, to whom *Abraham* was design'd to stand in such a paternal Relation, it every way agrees with the Apostle's Design, and fully confirms that which he brought it. For, if the Election obtain'd Faith, Righteousness, and Life, at the first preaching of the Gospel by Christ and his Apostles; so again, the Election in the last Days shall not fall short of it. If God is Faithful in converting the one, we may be assur'd he will be so in converting the other.

By the good *Olive-tree*, I understand the Church of God, as daily partaking of vital Influence from Christ, (who is eminently the good *Olive*, as he is also the *true Vine*) and so none are real *Branches* in it under the Gospel but sincere Believers; tho' all who profess to believe appear as *Branches*. But such of them as partake not of the like precious Faith, at length will certainly be discovered not to have been in truth, what they were in appearance; and such, till that Discovery be made, are call'd *Branches* in Christ, the *true Vine*, *John xv. 4.* because they were such by Profession, so esteem'd themselves and so reputed by others. There is no ground therefore to conclude, that any are intended in this Text as true and proper *Branches* in the good *Olive*, but those who are ingrafted into Christ by Faith; and such alone have a Right *in foro Dei*, in God's Account, to be Members of the visible Church in these Gospel days, tho' the Church in the reception of Members, can act but as Men, according to outward Appearance. The Members of the primitive Churches were called *Saints*, because, in Judgment of Charity, they were all accounted to be Partakers of inherent Holiness. None but Believers partake of the *Root and Fatness of the Olive-tree*, viz. The Divine Influences that flow from Christ, the Head, and Root, to his Body the Church, diffusing spiritual Life and Refreshment to every Member of his mystical Body, to every real *Branch* in him. The Difference between the *Jewish*, and Gospel Church, is not small; in that they had a Right to Membership by carnal Descent from *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*, whether they were true Believers or no, yea, tho' their Parents were not such; in this 'twill, I presume, be allow'd, by those at least with whom I am principally concern'd, that the Case is otherwise. This very Place shews, that the ingrafting, and standing is now by Faith, and so (as to the visible Church) it was not then. And what other probable Reason can be assign'd, why Unbelief should not cut off the Parents, and their Seed, when the Right of the Children then did not depend on the Faith of immediate Parents; except it be this, that the Covenant with the natural Seed is repeal'd, and that Church-stance into which they were admitted Members, remov'd?

We may also observe, that the Apostle is so far from countenancing any to pursue the *Metaphor*, here used by him, beyond what himself particularly insists on, that he doth not argue strictly from the Nature of the things alluded to, and the Usage of Men with respect to them. For Men do not take a Cion from a wild Stock to graff into one of a better kind, in order to produce better Fruit ; but on the contrary they graff a good Cion into a wild Stock, because the Fruit will be of that sort which the Cion would have produced, had it remained in its old Stock ; and not of the same kind with the Stock into which it is grafted. And of this he seems to give us some Intimation himself, *Ver. 24.* *For if thou wert cut out of the Olive-tree, which is wild by Nature, and grafted, contrary to Nature, into a good Olive-tree.* But 'tis time to consider what Mr. H. offers from this Text. And,

First, he asks what we are to understand by the *holy Root*, and *good Olive-tree* ? To this he answers, as to the *Root* :

1. *Not the Covenant of Works ; for Believers are not grafted into, but deliver'd from that Covenant.*

This I readily assent to, but see not well how it suits his purpose ; for the Covenant with the natural Seed promised Life only on perfect Obedience, (as we have shewn before) and if it be not the Covenant with the natural Seed, what is this to the natural Seed of Believers ?

2. *Not Jesus Christ neither.*

Altho' Christ be most properly and eminently the *Root*, whence Life, Growth and Fruitfulness, is conveyed to the *Branches* ; yet in this I agree with Mr. H. that the Apostle seems not directly and immediately to intend him in this place. But his other Reason to prove Christ is not here intended, because *the Jews are said to be natural Branches in this good Olive, but none are naturally in Christ*, deserves a little further Remark. For since he understands here (as we shall see presently) *Abraham as a Covenant Father, and the Covenant of Promise, which God made and establish'd with him and his Seed*, which he often tells us is the Covenant of Grace ; is it a greater Absurdity to affirm their being naturally in Christ, than their being naturally in the Covenant of Grace ? Is not Christ himself called *the Covenant of the People*, Isa. xlii. 6. xlix. 8 ? Is he the Sum of all the Covenant Blessings, and they all abridged in him, and can any be in Covenant, and not in Christ ? The Scripture speaks

expressly to the contrary, *Gal. iii. ult.* If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's Seed, i. e. interested in the Covenant of Grace, which God transacted with him in a peculiar manner. What is here suggested must, it seems, be such a Covenant of Grace, as freeth not from *Condemnation*; for they only are deliver'd thence, who are in Christ, *Rom. viii. 1.* such an one as gives no *Hope of Glory*; for they are in Christ, and he in them, who partake of that Hope, *Col. i. 27.*

3. *Not Mount Horeb's Covenant, nor the Jewish Church-state, considered as national under one High Priesthood, for these were abolished by Christ.*

That the Jewish Church was constituted *national* under one *High Priesthood*, 'tis plain; he here then grants that the Jewish Church-state, as constituted of God, is now *abolished*. He will say, he owns it abolished *as national*, but not that the whole *Fabric* was taken down. If God hath abolished a *national* Church-state, and given *Laws* for erecting another instead of it, no *Materials* must be put into this new *Building*, but what the Lord himself hath given *Commission* to place in it; and he has directed the laying *lively Stones*, and no other, into this *spiritual House*, *1 Pet. ii. 5.* Neither will it in the least follow, because *Infants* (tho' not as the *Infants* of immediate believing *Parents*, but only as descending from *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*) were Church-members then; that therefore the *Infants* of believing *Parents*, as such, must be Church-members now. God gave plain *Directions* for their *Reception* as *Members* then, but hath given no such *Directions* now; and had it been his *Will* now as it was then, the *Son*, as a *Fruit* of his *Love and Care*, would have given us as plain *Directions* for it, as the *Servant* did.

4. *Nor Abraham neither, as a natural Father, simply so considered, &c.*

This I readily grant, and withal conclude, that *Believers*, as natural *Parents*, convey no federal *Holiness*, or *Right of Church-membership* to their natural *Offspring*, as such; and if *Abraham's* had deriv'd an *Interest* in the *Covenant of Grace* from him, those natural *Branches* would never have been broken off. But he proceeds now to acquaint us directly what he understands by this holy *Root*.

5. *I understand* (says he) *by this holy Root, Abraham, as a Covenant Father, and the Covenant of Promise made with him and his Seed, Gen. xvii. 7, &c.*

That

That 'tis my Opinion likewise, that *Abraham* is here intended as a Covenant Father, I have shewn already; altho' I see no reason to believe, that the Covenant transacted with him, *Gen. xvii. 7.* for his natural Seed, is all the Apostle hath respect to in this place; but that as there was a Covenant established with him for his spiritual Seed, as well as for his natural, the former is more principally intended; tho' the Apostle in this Chapter may have some respect to them both, and consider *Abraham* as a Root, or Covenant-head to both those Seeds; the *natural Branches*, which were broken off, being his natural Seed only, and those of the *Jews* that stood being also his spiritual Seed, as well as the *Gentiles*, which were grafted in, and stood by Faith. And, I think Mr. *H.* may as well attempt to prove any thing, the most impossible in Nature, as that the natural Seed of Believers, as such, are the spiritual Seed of *Abraham*; and his natural Seed to be sure they are not. What this contributes then to evince the federal Holiness of Believers Children, I see not.

Secondly, he goes on to give us his Sense of the good Olive-tree, by which, says he, *I understand the Church of God, considered as visible, as growing on, and receiving its Fatness, that is, Privileges, from this holy Root or Covenant.*

Whether we understand by the good Olive, the visible, or invisible Church, consisting of God's Elect, (this latter being many times in holy Scripture called the Church, as, *Eph. i. 10. v. 25. Heb. xii. 23.*) so far as it respects the Church in Gospel times, the difference is not great; because none are Members of any particular visible Church, that are not Members of the invisible one; those only who have first given themselves to the Lord, and then give themselves to the Church, being fit to be received. And if the visible Church be here intended, it must be as consisting of particular Congregations, made up of proper Subjects. For none but sincere Believers partake of the Root and Fatness of the Olive-tree; and all that are here said to have a standing therein are Believers, such only being interested in the Covenant of Grace; neither is there the least Intimation of any belonging to it, but such as are ingrafted, which implies Union with Christ and his Church. And if by Privileges which Mr. *H.* says the Fatness of the Olive-tree denotes, that the ingrafted Gentiles partake of with the believing Jews) he intend external ones only, I conceive he is greatly mistaken.

mistaken. For the choicest and most spiritual Blessings which they receive thro' Believing (which external Ordinances are only a Means of conveying to them) must necessarily be meant by *the Fatness of the Olive-tree*, into which they are *ingrafted*, which flow from Christ to his whole Church, and every particular Member of it. But it will be said, Doth not the visible Church consist of many Members that are not united to Christ? and are not many united to Christ, that are no Members of any particular visible Church? I readily grant both. But as to the former, the Apostle may very well here be understood, as looking upon them what they ought to be, and as the Church is bound in Duty to take care, to the best of her knowledge, that they may be; and for the latter, they belong to the universal Church, are fit Subjects for a particular visible Church, and are willing, when God clears up their way, and gives them opportunity, to become Members of some particular Church of Christ's appointment. And I see not well what tolerable Sense he can fix upon the Apostle's Words, of *ingrafting Branches by Faith into the good Olive*, which were taken from the *wild Olive*; except by *the good Olive* we understand the Church, as united to Christ, and bringing forth good Fruit, being first made good by the Grace which floweth from Christ assimilating them to him, which is true of none but sound Believers. For he speaks of it as a glorious Privilege conferred on the *Gentiles*, and so it is to be a Member of the invisible Church, and no small one to be a fit Member of a particular visible Church. But I think it so far from being a Privilege conferred by God on any unrenewed Persons, to be admitted Members of a particular Church, that it is disallowed of God, and prejudicial to them. But under the Law it was much otherwise; there every circumcised Person had a Right to Membership in that National Church, and, being legally clean, to all the Ordinances appointed for it, whether they were regenerated or not; their legal Purification being typical of that inherent Holiness, which is necessary to give a just Right to the Ordinances of Christ in the Gospel Church. If then the same Qualifications were not prerequisites as necessary for Membership in the Jewish Church, which are in the Gospel Church, no solid Argument can be taken from the Subject of the former, to prove the Right of the same Subject to the latter. Their carnal Descent from *Abraham* gave

Right to Circumcision, and these two to all Privileges of Church Members; now we are to *know no Man after the Flesh any more*, 2 Cor. v. 16. And of this *John*, at the first Administration of the Gospel Ordinance of Baptism, gave notice to the Pharisees and Sadducees, when they came to demand Admittance to it, *Matt. iii. 8, 9. Bring forth therefore Fruits meet for Repentance, and think not to say within your selves, we have Abraham to our Father.* Nay in this very Chapter the Apostle tells us, *the natural Branches are broken off*, none but Believers, either of *Jews or Gentiles*, standing as *Branches in the good Olive* in these Gospel Times. From the whole I conclude, that that Church-state, and the Covenant whereon it was founded, are now abolished; and that none by their natural Descent can claim a Right of Admission into the Gospel Church; tho' the *Jews*, as *Abraham's* natural Seed, were owned of God as his Church and People, in that legal Dispensation, by which this more spiritual one was typified.

Thirdly, By natural Branches (says he) *we are to understand all those who were born within the Church and Covenant*, Gal. ii. 15. *such who were descended from former Profelytes, as well as such that were descended lineally from Abraham's Loins*, Numb. xv. 13 to the 17. John iv. 22. Ezek. xlvii. 22. & xvi. 20, 21. *both Hebrews of the Hebrews, (as Paul was) and Hebrews of former Profelytes, were natural Branches of the good Olive-tree.*

If the whole of this be granted, Mr. H. will gain nothing from it; unless he could prove that the Covenant and Church-state into which they were received, was the same that believing Gentiles are now under; tho' what he says here does not appear so clear and well proved, as he would perswade us. That no *Stranger* sojourning among the Children of *Israel* in the Land of *Canaan* might eat the *Passover* without submitting to Circumcision, is plain from *Exod. xii. 48, 49.* he and every Male in his House, as well Servants as Children; and, that when he and his Males were circumcised, he and his Household were admitted to the *Passover*, and other Offerings, 'tis no less evident, *Numb. ix. 14. xv. 14, 15.* But, that the Children and Servants of these *Strangers*, who by God's appointment were to be admitted to Circumcision, and other *Jewish* Ordinances, were *natural Branches in the good Olive*, is easier said than proved. That they, as such, were interested in the Covenant of Grace, none,

none, who consider well what they say, will assert; or, that such as these, some of whom might perhaps be *compelled by their Masters to submit to Circumcision, may warrantably be admitted into the Gospel Church, altho' they were into the *Jewish*. So far is it from being true, that the same Subjects, that were by God's appointment admitted into the one, have a Right of Admission into the other. But it will be said, 'Tis the Children only, and not Servants of Profelytes, that are *natural Branches in the good Olive*, as being born of Church Members. But then the Offspring of these Slaves must be accounted *natural Branches* too, as being born of Church Members. Ought the Christians in *America* to require all their Slaves to be baptiz'd, and all the Children born of them in their Houses? And ought all these, together with their Christian Masters, be admitted Members of the Church; and the Children of these Slaves, only on the account of the Membership of their Parents (of whom Faith and Repentance were not required as necessary Prerequisites to their Admission) be accounted *natural Branches* in the Christian Church? This I have the more reason to press, because he intimates that the *Admission* of Profelytes into the *Jewish Church*, was design'd perhaps to foreshew how freely and abundantly the Gentiles should be received into the same Covenant of Abraham, they and their Seed with them, when the Wall of Partition should be broken down again, p. 39. I think it is plain therefore, that by the *natural Branches*, in this place, only the natural Seed of Abraham are intended, which the Posterity of Profelytes were not; it being the natural Posterity of Abraham by Isaac, whose future Conversion the Apostle here foretels, and withall endeavours to prevent the Gentiles insulting over. Nay it is directly contrary to his Scope and Design to interpret the *natural Branches* to intend profelyted Gentiles as well as natural Jews, as Mr. H. asserts.

As to what he adds further, *That the after Posterity of Profelytes, that settled among and continued in the Church of Israel, were not in after Ages called Profelytes, but Jews, &c.* it hath only his positive Assertion. And 'tis well known there was sufficient ground to continue that Distinction between Jews and Profelytes on the account of the Inheritance

* See Mr. Pool's Annot. on Exod. xii. 44. cited before in p. 82.

ces, which *Profelytes* had no Right to possess with the *Jews*, in the Land of *Canaan*.

But he subjoins, *Tea sometimes the Profelytes themselves were called Jews*, *Esth. viii. 17.* and *Jether, an Ishmaelite being become a Profelyte, is call'd an Israelite*, *1 Chron. ii. 17.* with *2 Sam. xvii. 25.* In *Esth. viii. 17.* we are told, *Many of the People of the Land became Jews, for the Fear of the Jews fell upon them.* But the Compliance of the Persons there spoken of, with Circumcision, who it is likely also for a time professed to turn from dumb Idols to the living God, was the effect of Fear and not of Faith; for dreading the *Jews* Resentments of their former Provocations, they hypocritically feigned themselves of their Religion, seeing them to be the Men in favour at Court, and thence are called after their Name. Whether Mr. *H.* would have the Posterity of these Men pass for *natural Branches*, as the Design of his bringing this Instance seems to import, I know not. But if these were natural Branches in the *Jewish Church*, it will make that Church look too unlike the Churches of Christ's Appointment under the Gospel, to leave any room for an Imagination, that the same Church-state is yet remaining; or, that the Right of Infants to Membership in the Gospel Church is like to receive much countenance from the Children of *Profelytes* being born Members of that legal one. As to his other Instance of *Jether the Ishmaelite being called an Israelite*, Mr. *Poole* tells us 'tis not *Jether*, but his Son *Amasa*, who is meant *2 Sam. xvii. 25.* His Words are: "*Ithra, or Jether, Amasa's Father, is called an Ishmaelite, 1 Chron. ii. 17.* because he was such, either by his Birth from such Parents, or by his long Habitation among them, or for some other Reason now unknown. And *Amasa* is here called an *Israelite*, either, because he was a *Profelyte*; or, in opposition to *Joab*, who was of the Tribe of *Judah*, as *Amasa* was one of the ten Tribes; or rather, to intimate, that altho' he or his Parents were called *Ishmaelites* for some reason, yet as to their Extraction they were indeed *Israelites*. Which if *Amasa* had not been, 'tis not probable that he could have had so powerful an Influence upon the Tribe of *Judah*, as he had, *Chap. ix. 14.*" But supposing it either *Amasa* or *Jether* that is here intended, we see Mr. *Poole*, after his long Converse with the best *Critics* and *Commentators*, remained doubtful as to the true Reason of his being called an *Israelite*, which

which Mr. H. adventures positively to determine as a Matter of no difficulty.

But he goes on ; *In this Rom. xi. the holy Root is spoken of as still in being, as a Root now under the New Testament.*

The Covenant of Grace, transacted with Abraham for his spiritual Seed, is yet in being ; but the Covenant made with him for his natural Seed was abolished by Christ.

He adds ; *And the good Olive-tree is spoken of, as still standing, and retaining its Fatness : Some of the Branches were broken off from it indeed, but the Tree was not broken down, as some would have it.*

As God had a Church under the Law, so he has also a more spiritual Church under the Gospel ; and as Believers were then united to Christ, and received continual Supplies from him, they no less receive them now, tho' the Church-state be different.

He adds further ; *Again, we read that some, not all of the natural Branches were broken off from the good Olive-tree ; and that some Branches were cut out of the wild Olive-tree, and were grafted into the good Olive-tree.*

It must be owned that all the Jews were not cut off from a Right to Membership in the true Church, both the Believers among them, as well as those gathered out of the Gentiles, being received into the Gospel Church. But altho' the former were indulged a while in holding occasional Communion with the Jewish Church in some virtually abrogated Ordinances ; yet they were no longer Members of that, but of a Gospel Church, far different from it, both as to Matter and Form.

But Mr. H. proceeds now to bring this Matter into a small compass, for he tells us in his next Words, *The Question is but this ; Whether the Children of those Israelites that were broken off, were broken off with their Parents ? And whether the Children of those Gentiles that were ingrafted, were ingrafted with their Parents ?*

All Unbelievers, whether Parents or Children, are cut off from a Right of Admission into the Gospel Church, the standing therein being by Faith, as the Apostle expressly declares ; and all Believers, whether Parents or Children have a just Right of Admission into it. If the Parents be Believers, and not the Children, the Parents are admitted, and not they ; if the Children are Believers, and the Parents remain in Unbelief, the Children ought to be admitted

and the Parents rejected; and herein *Jews* and *Gentiles* stand upon equal Ground. And that the Children of any, either *Jews* or *Gentiles*, are not to be receiv'd on account of their Parents Faith, I have endeavour'd to prove already, and more shall be said on that Head in the close of this Chapter.

But let us hear his Answer to this *Question*, which he gives us in five Particulars.

1. *It is clear from many Texts of Holy Scripture, that Infants are called Buds (render'd Offspring) of their Parents, who are the Branches out of which they bud and bring. Nay, when a Branch hath budded, these Buds are in the Branch as a part thereof; so that if a Person break off a Branch from a Tree when it hath Buds on it, he breaks off the Buds with the Branch. And 'tis matter of Fact, that when these Branches of the good Olive-tree were broken off, their Buds, their Offspring, were broken off with them, and so continue to this very Day.*

The latter part of these Words contains an Answer to the preceding *Question*, so far as relates to the cutting off the *Jews*; as the former part assigns a Reason, or Illustration of it. In return to the Answer, I have no occasion to add any thing to what I have last said. But, as to the Reason, If there is nothing so sottish or foolish, (as we heard before from Dr. O.) as may not be countenanc'd from teaching Parables and Similitudes to be instructive, and proving in every Parcel or Expression that attends them; what must be thought of his arguing from Branches to Buds, when the Apostle does not so much as mention Buds, nor intimate the cutting off any, but for their own Unbelief, nor of the grafting in of any but actual Believers. And could he prove that the Offspring of Persons are sometimes intended by Buds, what Service would it do him, unless he could also shew, that where Excision from, or Admission into the Church in Gospel times is spoken of, that Term is ever so used in the Sense he would force upon this Place? But tho' at other times he plies us with a numerous Citation of Scriptures, for the most part little or nothing to the purpose; yet here he has contented himself barely to assert, that where the original Word imports *Buds*, our Translators have many times render'd it *Offspring*, without directing us to one Instance of that Nature. And he might as well (when his hand

was

was in) have pursued the Similitude a little further, and put us in Mind, that when ingrafted Branches produce Fruit, within the Fruit are contain'd Seeds, which being sown, produce Stocks, yielding Fruit of a wild Kind; and thence have infer'd, what every ones Observation may confirm, that Children of good Parents derive not Grace from them, but stand in as much need of ingrafting by Faith as their Parents did.

But, as if he had sufficiently prov'd from Branches bearing Buds, and the natural Branches being broken off, that the Offspring of the *Jews* were broken off with their Parents; he would in the next place infer the ingrafting the Offspring of believing *Gentiles* with their Parents. But as the Servants of the natural *Jews* and *Profelytes* were admitted into that Church with their Masters; if (as he saith) *the ingrafting of the Gentiles must be suitable to the breaking the Jews off*, he must assert the Right of Believers Servants, as well as that of their Children, or else the Case is not parallel.

2. *The ingrafted Branches could not be said to have a mutual Fellowship, or to partake with the Jews of the Root and Fatness of the Olive-tree, as they are, Verse 17. if they had not the same Privilege for their Buds, or Offspring, as the natural Branches had for theirs; for then they would want one of the chiefest Privileges which the natural Branches enjoy'd. For a Branch to partake of the Root and Fatness of the Olive-tree, is to have Sap and Virtue from the Root to live, grow, and bud; and for its Buds to become Branches, and bear Buds, &c. so long as they abide in the Root.*

By their partaking with the *Jews, of the Root and Fatness of the Olive-tree*, the Apostle cannot intend, with those that were broken off, but only with the Believers of that typical People, who stood when the others were broken off. For the former never partook of the choicest Blessings of the Covenant of Grace, which the believing Members of the *Jewish Church* did all along, and those of the Gospel Church now do. And that the Offspring of the believing *Jews* were not admitted to Baptism and Church-membership with their Parents, save only those of them who appear'd to have been effectually call'd, has, I think, been sufficiently proved. But his Exposition of partaking of the Root and Fatness of the Olive-tree, seems to me very dark and intricate. I would not understand

what

what he says of having *Sap and Virtue from the Root to live, grow, and bud*, of an animal Life, growth of Body, and procreation of Children; and if a spiritual Life, and growth of Grace be intended, as this inables them not to bear Buds, so neither will it bring their Seed within the Bond of the New and Everlasting Covenant, as is before proved at large.

3. In Verse 22. *God's Act to the Branches broken off, is called his Severity on them; and his Act towards the ingrafted Branches is call'd his Goodness towards them.* 'Tis evident, that this *Act of Severity* reach'd to the breaking off the unbelieving Jews, and their Seed with them; therefore this *Act of Goodness* to Gentile Believers, did suitably reach to the ingrafting of believing Gentiles, and their Seed with them. To deny this, is to say, that God's Goodness is not so great in ingrafting new Branches, as his Severity in breaking off the old ones, contrary to Verse 11, 31. and to the Current of scripture.

Having already shewn that only Unbelievers were broken off, and none but Believers grafted in; 'tis sufficient that the Suitableness between the breaking off the Jews, and ingrafting of the Gentiles, answer in that respect, as manifestly does; nor is there any thing in the Words, or the *Apostle's* Design to authorize our straining it any further. Neither does it follow, as Mr. H. would persuade us, that if the Agreement reach not to the ingrafting of believing Gentiles, and their Seed with them, the Goodness of God is not so great in this Case, as his Severity; since the advantages granted to the Offspring of God's People under the Gospel are vastly preferable to those under the Law, altho' they are not now admitted to Church-membership in their Infancy, as then they were. For the means of eternal Life and Happiness, as now reveal'd with far greater Clearness, abundantly excels all the Privileges which the carnal Seed, the Types of the spiritual, enjoy'd before.

4. In Verse 23, 24, &c. there is a Promise, that the Jews in the latter end, shall be grafted into their own Olive-tree, therefore their own Olive is not cut down, but stands with the old Privilege of Parents having their Children in Covenant with themselves; and when the Jews are grafted in again, their Buds; or Offspring, shall be ingrafted with them, Verse 26, 27, 28. with *Isa. lix. 20, 21. Ezek. xxxvii. 24, 25, 26.*

130 *An Answer to Mr. H's Seventh Chapter.*

Zech. x. 6, 7, 8, 9. Therefore the Gentiles were, and are ingrafted, they, and their Children with them, else there is no Suitableness, &c.

The Apostle here speaks of the grafting in of no more of the Jews in the last Days, but such as shall believe *Verse 23. And they also, if they abide not still in Unbelief shall be grafted in.* As we have no Account of the Admission of any more of the *First-fruits* of that People in the primitive times, but actual Believers; not a word of their *Buds*; so as little is said of the grafting in of any at last but the Election, partaking of Faith as the Effect of God's Purpose of Grace. Nor do any of the Scriptures, to which he directs us, intimate any such thing as he produces them for. *Isa. lix. 20, 21.* speaks of the Seed the Father hath given to Christ, and contains a Promise made to him concerning them. *Ezek. xxxvii. 24, 25, 26. & Zech. x. 6, 7, 8, 9.* speak of the happy and flourishing Estate which the Jews and their Posterity, after their Restoration from Captivity, shall enjoy in the Land of *Canaan*; but not the least Hint of their Children, before they appear to be Believers, being admitted with their Parents into the Gospel Church.

5. In *Verse 17. 'tis said, some of the Branches were broken off, therefore not all; and Verse 20. because of Unbelief they were broken off. Therefore none who believed were broken off, but stood as before, they and their Children with them.*

The Church-state being alter'd, the unbelieving Jews who before had a Right to Church-membership, are now excluded. As to those who believ'd, they were not broken off from a Relation to God as his Church, tho' they stood not Members of the same Church to which their Birth-privilege gave them Admittance. But that in the Gospel Church the Children of these were Members with them, since no such thing is intimated by the Apostle, shall take the liberty to deny, till I see it better proved. And till then I shall likewise think what follows of Force, when he tells us, that *there would have been a School in the first Churches, if the Children of the believing Gentiles had not been admitted with them, as well as those of the Jews*; since we have equal Reason to disbelieve the Admission of either.

We have done with *Rom. xi.* and as to what he says, p. 7 I acknowledge that the Prophets and Apostles preach

the same *Doctrine*, with respect to the way and means of attaining eternal Life; but does it thence follow that they directed the People to the Observation of all the same Ordinances; or, declar'd that all the same Persons who had a Right of Admission into the legal Church, have the same under the Gospel?

Page 77. he brings in *Ephes. ii.* Where the Apostle tells them, that before their Conversion they were *Aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel, and Strangers from the Covenants of Promise, far off, but now made nigh by the Blood of Christ, fellow-citizens with the Saints, &c.* From whence he infers; therefore be sure they have the very same Franchises and Privileges for themselves and Seed, which before did belong to the Citizens, as such; all having but one and the same Character, viz. The Covenant of Promise, which runs to Believers, and their Seed.

When the Apostle tells the *Ephesians* they had formerly been *Aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel, and Strangers from the Covenants of Promise, far off*, he seems plainly to intimate their not being interested either in the Covenant made with the natural, or the spiritual Seed of *Abraham*. And the former of these being at that time abolish'd, he can only intend that upon their Conversion they were received into the latter, and so made *Fellow-citizens with the spiritual Seed of Abraham*, which has been sufficiently shewn not to answer Mr. H's Purpose. When he insinuates that *we would have the Gentiles be still Strangers and Aliens*, I can't help saying, there is not the least appearance either of Truth or Justice in that Assertion; it being our earnest Desire that our own, and others Children might no longer remain so, but become *Fellow-citizens with the Saints, and of the Household of God*. And as true and charitable is his Inference in the same Page, when he says, *To deny this Truth, is to deny the Death and Bloodshed of Jesus Christ, as to one great End thereof*. For if Christ had shed his Blood to bring all the Seed of Believers into a Participation of New Covenant Blessings, no one of them should eternally perish; for the Father will not deny his Son any thing, which he purchas'd with the Price of his Blood.

When he tells us afterwards, that the *New Testament Church is call'd a Commonwealth, a City, an Household*; every of which Terms doth plainly include *Children, as Members thereof*;

132 *An Answer to Mr. H's Seventh Chapter.*

thereof; this proves as much that *National* and *Parochial* Churches are of Divine Institution, as the Right of Infants to Baptism; for all the Inhabitants of a *Country, City, or Household*, are included in the ordinary use of those Terms.

He observes, p. 79. when the *Apostle* came to speak particularly to the several Members of the Church at Ephesus, about their relative Duties, he speaks to Parents and Children, and yet writes to none but visible Saints, and Church-members. And, Children are commanded to obey their Parents in the Lord; a Phrase peculiar to those in Covenant.

Certainly the *Apostle* never imagined that Children, who knew not their *Right Hand from their Left*, were in the least capable to understand the Directions there given; and therefore can't rationally be supposed to have intended them for their Instruction, but for those only who were arriv'd to Years of Understanding. And we never question'd the Right of such Children to Gospel Ordinances, when Profession of Faith is made by them. Doth mature Age dissolve the Relation between Parents and Children? Or Are Children, when come to Years of Understanding, freed from the Obligation, which bound them before, to obey their Parents? His telling us that here, and in Col. i. the Children of the Church are expressly called Saints, will never prove the *Apostle* writ to Infants. And as to that Phrase in the Lord, good Expositors understand it either to contain a Reason of the Duty, viz. Because the Lord commands it; or else to prescribe just Bounds to the Obedience required; viz. in all things that are agreeable to God's Will.

He informs us, p. 80, & 81. That Christians now are as much bound by the Command to educate their Children for God as the Israelites formerly were. Which is readily granted. But he adds; That the Duty should remain, and the Privileges, Means and Advantages for performing it, be taken away is strange Doctrine. What! make Brick without Straw again. The Children of Israel did educate their Children in the Church as being actually under Covenant and Seal: They had many precious Promises made to their Children, to quicken their Endeavours in educating them. But when such Children, who are excluded by their Parents, do refuse to learn Christian Doctrine or to carry it reverently to God's Word and Worship, how can their Parents use Discipline to correct them for such things?

I could never observe, tho' I have had as much Opportunity for it as some others, that the Advantages of the Pedobaptists in educating their Children for God, were greater than ours; some of both Perswasions mourning that the Fear of God was not placed in the Hearts of their Children; and others again having comfortable Hopes that their Children truly feared Him. We may warrantably assure them, that Christ, with all his Benefits, is freely held forth to them in the Promises of the Gospel, and shall be theirs, on their receiving him by Faith; and our Brethren can't but think themselves obliged to let their Children know, that unless they repent and believe, their Condition will be miserable for ever. But so far as their acquainting them that Interest in the Covenant is a Birth-privilege, may occasion their thinking the New Birth less needful, our Opinion appears to have the advantage, as I have hinted before. What he means by *educating Children in the Church*, I know not; nor how this is done by Pedobaptists more than by us. Have not Parents a natural Right to reprove, or otherwise correct their Children, as occasion requires, unless they own them as Members with them of the same Church? Or, our Pedobaptist Brethren look upon themselves obliged, to admonish their Children privately for their Faults; and if that be not effectual, to take with them one or two more of the Members of the same Church; and that proving unsuccessful, to bring it to the Church; and on default of hearing them, to excommunicate them; as our Lord directs touching offending Church-members, *Matt. xviii. 15, 16, 17*? Or, are Parents intrusted with the Power of the Church towards such Infant-members?

What he says of the great *Affliction that it must be to Parents to cohabit with Heathens*, cannot concern us, unless he meant, that Persons by Baptism are translated from Heathenism to Christianity; which would be an easy way of making Christians: or, that all are to be reputed Heathen, who are not Church Members; whereas I thought all ought to be visible Saints, before they have a Right of Admission to the Church. But certainly the greatest Affliction to godly Parents, whether Pedobaptists or Antipedobaptists, is, when their Children appear ignorant of Christ and regenerate; till the same effectual Grace exert its force in their Hearts, whereby the Offspring of many Unbelievers have been brought into a State of Salvation.

He goes on to tell us, p. 82. that *Paul was no Anabaptist* which may be granted him, without Wrong to the Cause pleaded by us, who as much disapprove Rebaptization, as those that oppose us. But that St. *Paul* was not of the same Opinion with those he so calls, viz. that only professing Believers ought to be baptiz'd, he will not be able to prove. He cites indeed for that purpose *1 Cor. viii. 14. Rom. xi. 28. Acts xvii. 31. Rom. xi. 16.* the first of which only remains to be examin'd, all the rest having been already considered, and prov'd, I think, no way subservient to his Design.

The Apostle's Words in *1 Cor. viii. 14.* are, *For the unbelieving Husband is sanctified by the Wife, and the unbelieving Wife is sanctified by the Husband: else were your Children unclean; but now are they holy.* The Words in the Original, which our Translation renders, *is sanctified by the Wife, and by the Husband,* are, *ἡγιασται ἐν τῇ γυναίκῃ, and, ἐν τῷ ἀνδρὶ.* Which perhaps in this place had been more justly expressed, *is, or, hath been sanctified to the Wife, and, to the Husband.* In which Sense the Preposition *ἐν* is put for *eis*, as in *Luke i. 17. ἐμπερίτω ἀπειθεῖς ἐν πατρὶσι καὶ ἐν κυρίῳ, to turn the Disobedient to the Wisdom of the Just.* But as to this Passage of the Apostle, let it be considered,

1. That the *Holiness* of the Children, being such as they derive from both their Parents, can be of no other kind than what both of them partook of; since the Apostle assures us, that if either Parent was unholy, in the Sense he intends, the Children would be so also. And therefore this *Holiness*, which he ascribes to the unbelieving Parent, not giving that Parent a Right to Baptism; neither can the *Holiness* of the Children, derived from the Unbeliever as well as from the Believer, convey that Right to them.

2. Among so many, some of their Children were doubtless grown up to the Estate of Men and Women, and had been born whilst their Parents were both Unbelievers, many Years before the Apostle *Paul* preached the Gospel among them, as may appear from what has been said before in p. 82 concerning the time when this *Epistle* was writ; and yet he declares of their Children in general, whether elder or younger, that they were *holy* in the Sense he intended which certainly could not give them all a Right to Baptism since our Brethren own that actual Faith is necessary in the Adult. And how the same *Holiness* should intitle Infants to that, which it does not either the Parent or adult Children

will, I believe, be very difficult to demonstrate.

3. Tho' it appears from what hath been said, that there is no necessity for the Antipedobaptists to determine of what kind the *Holiness* is, which the Apostle here ascribes to Children; yet, that it is *Legitimacy*, and not any such external *federal Holiness*, as many Pedobaptists would persuade us, hath been owned by many eminent *Expositors*; as *Ferom, Ambrose, Melancthon, Camerarius, Musculus, &c.* who have been cited by others; to whom I shall only add *Humnius*, a zealous *Lutheran*, and strenuous Opposer of the Anabaptists (as he calls them) who in his *Commentary* on this Place gives a fair and full account of the Words. And first, as to the *Sanctification* of the unbelieving Parent, he tells us; *Intelligitur enim hic civilis seu legalis sanctificatio, qua sanctum dicitur omne, cujus usus verbo Dei concessus est, &c.* i. e. *A civil or legal Holiness is here intended, in which respect any thing, the Use whereof is warranted by the Word of God, may be said to be holy.* And then, as to the *Holiness* of the Children, he says; *Esse impar illud conjugium, nihilominus vere legitimum, Deoque placens, probat inde, quia alias liberi ex eo nati immundi forent, id est, non e legitimo toro nati, & proinde spurii, quorum procreatio parentibus illis fuisset immunda & inconcessa. Quia vero nemo dubitat liberos illos esse sanctos, eadem videlicet sanctitate civili, qua prius virum infidelem per uxorem fidelem sanctificari dixerat; concludit inde, conjugis quoque infidelis usum illum, e quo liberi isti procreantur, esse fideli conjugii licitum, sanctum & concessum.* i. e. *He proves from hence, that such a Marriage, tho' unequal, was nevertheless truly lawful, and pleasing to God, because otherwise the Children born in it would be unclean, i. e. not born of a lawful Bed, and therefore Bastards, whose Procreation would have been unclean and forbidden to those Parents. But as none doubts but such Children are holy, viz. with the same civil Holiness, wherewith he had before said that the unbelieving Husband was sanctified by the believing Wife; he thence concludes that such an Use also of the Unbelieving Husband, or Wife; whereby these Children are procreated, was lawful to the Believer, holy and warrantable.*

There is nothing further in Mr. H's VII Chapter, but what has been answered already; and therefore instead of troubling the Reader with Repetitions, I shall offer a few Considerations more, to prove that the Faith of Parents don't make their Children Church Members, nor the Practice of

our Brethren allow them to be such, tho' they give them that Name. For the proof of the former, let it be considered,

1. The Faith of the Parent makes not himself a Member of any particular Church, but his voluntary offering himself unto the Church for that end, and the Church's Acceptance of him upon that Offer. This I suppose will be granted by Mr. H. Now, if the Parent's Faith makes not himself a *Church Member*, 'twill not make his Children *Church Members*; for it cannot rationally be supposed to convey that to them, which it doth not to him. That there are believing Parents who are not Members of any particular Church, (and there is no other Church of Christ's Appointment under the Gospel) I presume will not be denied; and where the believing Parent is not a Member of any such Church, I would fain know what Church his Children are made Members of by his Faith?

2. The Constitution of Churches, and determining the Matter of them, depends wholly upon Institution; therefore under the Law God gave particular Directions who should be admitted, and beyond his Direction it was unlawful to admit any. When it was his Pleasure that Children and Servants should be admitted, he expressly signified his Will therein; and that Covenant of Peculiarity, and the Church-state founded on it, being now abolished, and a new Church-state erected, with new Officers and Ordinances, we have no way to know what Materials our Lord would have laid into this new and spiritual Building, but from his Command, and the Comment made thereon by the Practice of his Apostles, who were under the infallible Conduct of the Holy Spirit. Our Lord's Command, recorded *Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.* requireth, (1.) The *making Disciples by Teaching*; (2.) The *baptizing* the Disciples so made; (3.) The *teaching them* (i. e. the Disciples so made and baptiz'd) *to observe all things whatsoever he had commanded*, of which the Performance of those Duties, and Celebration of those Ordinances, which belong to a Church, as such, are no small part. And if Infants are not capable of being *made Disciples by teaching*, they are not comprehended in this Commission of our Saviour. And we have seen before, that the Apostles and Primitive Ministers in their Practice thus expounded our Lord's Command; who first taught, then baptiz'd, and afterwards received such into Church

Church Fellowship, to whom their Ministry was made thus effectual. And the Scriptures give us not the least hint of the Admission of any other; and what they don't reveal in this case, we have no ground to believe was done. The Lord undoubtedly directed the committing to Writing the Practice of the Apostles in gathering Churches, that his People might be guided by their Example in after Ages, to the End of the World. Was there as plain Direction given for the Admission of Infants, as Adult, into the *Mosaical* Church, and frequent Examples of it left to assure them of his Will therein, during the Continuance of that Dispensation; and would not our Blessed Lord have given the least hint, by Precept, or Precedent, of the Admission of any but adult Believers under the Gospel, if he designed the Children should be admitted with their Parents? Wherefore instead of arguing from Childrens Church-membership *under the Law*, to their Right to it *under the Gospel*, we have Reason to conclude rather, from the plain Directions given for the former, and the total Silence of the Scriptures with respect to the latter, that it is not our Lord's Will they should be now received; the Bondwoman and her Son, *i.e.* the *Sinai* Covenant and carnal Seed, no longer holding their former Station, but the New Covenant, to which the former was subservient for a Season, and the spiritual Seed, typify'd by the carnal, now taking place in the room thereof.

I now proceed to shew, that notwithstanding Mr. H's earnest Plea for the *Church-membership* of Believers Children, our Pedobaptist Brethren don't seem by their Practice to account them in reality Church Members.

1. They admit them to no Ordinance peculiar to *Church Members*; none of which, if they account them real *Members*, should, I think, be denied them. Of this sort is the Supper of our Lord; from which no Member of the Primitive Churches was debar'd, unless on the account of Heresy or Immorality. This is plain from 1 Cor. x. 17. *For we, being many, are one Bread, and one Body; for we are all Partakers of that one Bread.* That the Apostle here speaks of partaking of the Lord's Supper, the Context evidently shews. Now, either there were no Infant Members of the Church of *Corinth*, or they were admitted to partake with the Adult at the Lord's Table; the latter our Brethren deny, and the former must then necessarily follow. And I shewed

138 *An Answer to Mr. H's Seventh Chapter.*

shewed before, that in the first Gospel Church at *Jerusalem*, those that were baptiz'd, and added to the Church, are in general said to *continue in the Apostles Doctrine and Fellowship*, Acts ii. 41, 42.

2. They don't deal with them as *Church Members*, altho' they prove profane, when grown up. If they account them to be indeed *Members of the Church*, why don't they proceed towards them as our Lord hath directed his Churches to do towards scandalous Members, *Matt. xviii. 15, 16, 17.* *If thy Brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his Fault between thee and him alone; but if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more; and if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an Heathen Man and a Publican,* 2 *Thess. iii. 6.* Now we command you, Brethren, in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every Brother that walketh disorderly. If Believers Children are born *Church Members*, they must surely so continue till excommunicated by the Church; and I never yet heard that our Brethren cast out any of these Members by Birth, altho' some of them have proved openly and scandalously vicious, when grown up.

3. Our *Independent Brethren* especially, so far as I understand, use the same Method in admitting these, when adult, as they would do in receiving converted *Pagans*; for they require a Confession of Faith, and a Declaration of their Experiences; and without Satisfaction as to a Work of Grace on their Souls, receive them not to the Privileges of the Church. But if they were born *Church Members*, and never cast out, how can they be added to the Church when grown up? If there was so vast a difference between them, and the Children of *Pagans*, in Infancy, how come they to make none afterwards?

C H A P. VIII.

An Answer to Mr. H's Eighth Chapter.

I Come now to his VIII. *Chapter*, in which he attempts the Proof of *Childrens Covenant-interest*, &c. from *Types and Figures*; of these he gives us *six Instances*. But if what he pleads for had been well proved before, such Illustrations would be needless; and as it has not, 'tis very unlikely that these should contribute much towards it. For unless he was able to shew from the Scriptures, that these things were not only typical of something under the Gospel, but of the same things that he contends for, *viz. Infants Covenant-interest and Church-membership*, they prove nothing. The wildest Fancies may very easily be countenanc'd, if Persons may take a liberty to affirm, that every thing in Holy Scripture, wherein they can feign some Similitude and Agreement with the Notion or Practice they espouse, is a *Type* of it, and sufficient to prove it warrantable. But I shall proceed to consider a little the several Instances alleged by him. And,

I. *Noah and all his House were saved in the Ark, which was a Figure of the Gospel Salvation.*

But it may not be amiss to observe here, that none but adult Persons were saved from the Deluge in the Ark. Neither have we any ground to believe, that every one of that Family was eternally saved. The Sin of *Ham*, and the Curse pronounced against him and his Son *Canaan*, seems rather design'd of God to caution Parents and Children from concluding, that the Parent's Faith puts his Children into a State of Salvation, or that great temporal Deliverances are a Proof of their Title to eternal Happiness. But, as the eternal Perdition of all the Ungodly at the last Day was typify'd by the Destruction of the old World at the universal Deluge, in the Days of *Noah*, 2 *Pet.* ii. 3, 5. *Matt.* xxiv. 38, 39. so the Preservation of *Noah*, and seven of his Family with him, in the Ark, was a *Type* of the eternal Salvation by Christ at the Last Day, of all that are interest-ed in him. And as to 1 *Pet.* iii. 20, 21. cited by Mr. H. it seems principally to respect the temporal Salvation, which God would grant to them who professed Faith in Christ,

Christ, and love to him, when he should bring the threatened Vengeance on the unbelieving *Jews*. See Dr. Owen's *Expos. on Heb. Chap. xi. 7.* Is this *Text*, which asserts that the Answer of a good Conscience towards God, is necessary in the Subjects of Baptism, very likely to confirm any in Mr. H's Opinion?

II. *When the Lord came to deliver the People of Israel from the Kingdom, Power and Slavery of Pharaoh, to be a more visible Kingdom and Church to himself, the Type or Figure of Christ, redeeming and delivering his People in all Ages from the Kingdom, Power and Slavery of Satan, and bringing them into his own visible Kingdom; Pharaoh, the Devil's Type, refuseth to let the Children go with their Parents.*

It seems very hard to be represented as acting like *Pharaoh*, and the Devil himself, for not believing what we cannot find that God hath reveal'd, and refusing to practise that which he hath not requir'd. Tho' I suppose the Reader is by this time sensible, that Mr. H. instead of solid Argument, generally puts us off with *Hints*, as unaccountable as unusual. But one would think, no rational Man can suppose, *Pharaoh's* refusing to let the Children go, when he knew that God requir'd it, to the End he might after the Departure of the *Men*, in a few Years have their room supply'd by the Slavery of their Offspring; and our not owning our Children's Right to Baptism, till they make a Profession of their Faith, and forbearing to administer it to them, lest we should offend God by doing that in his Name which he hath not commanded, do so answer each other, that the former should be accounted a *Type* of the latter. Nor can God's requiring the Deliverance of the Children from *Egyptian* Bondage, as well as the Parents, any more prove the Right of Infants to Baptism, without a Divine Precept, than it would have justify'd their circumcising them if God had not injoin'd it; Baptism as much depending on the positive Command of God, as Circumcision, both as to the Subjects, Time and Manner of its Administration. The Females then were also deliver'd as well as the Males; and yet the former had not thence any Right to an initiating Sign or Seal, because God had not requir'd it. And if any Command for the baptizing of Infants could have been produc'd, things so remote would hardly have been insisted on.

III. In *Exod. xii. 7, 13, &c.* We read that the typical Blood was to be struck with a Bunch of Hyssop on the Door-posts of their Houses. Here in the Type of our spiritual Deliverance, the Blood was applied to them as Houses, because they all, even old and young, were the Lord's People, his Covenant People.

If the striking of the Blood upon the Door-posts of the Houses did not signify the Interest of all in that House, to which it was so applied, in the Covenant of Grace, and the Heads of every House were not sincere Believers, as the subsequent History of their Deportment plainly shews; this is very unlikely to prove the Covenant-interest of the Children of Believers now.

IV. In the Year of Jubilee, on the Day of Atonement, the Trumpet sounded, and Liberty to Parents and Children was proclaim'd throughout all the Land, *Lev. xxv. 9, 10.* which figur'd the preaching of the Gospel. See *Psal. lxxxix. 15. Isa. lxi. 1, 2.* with *Luke iv. 18, 19. &c.*

Let it be observ'd, (1.) That the Bondmen of other Nations, which were sold to them, had a Right to Circumcision and the Passover, as well as those who were native Jews; and yet there was no Release for them, nor their Children, tho' all of them were circumcis'd, and the Fathers in Mr. H's Sense adult Believers, for so he calls the Bondmen in Abraham's House. (2.) A Jew, who thro' Poverty sold himself to one of his own Nation, had a Right of Release when he had serv'd six Years; but if his Master had given him a Wife, neither she, nor the Children he had by her, were to be released with him, *Exod. xxi. 4.* But it seems from *Lev. xxv. 40, 41.* that in the fiftieth Year, tho' he had consented to abide with his Master after he was at liberty to depart, both he and his were then released, if they liv'd so long; and some of his Children might by that time be upwards of forty Years of Age. Now, either let Mr. H. own this Instance nothing to the Purpose, or else give us good Proof, that if a Parent be converted by the Gospel, who hath adult Children, these Children are by his Faith brought into the Covenant of Grace, and have a Right of Admission to Baptism, and Church-membership, altho' they remain without personal Faith.

V. *Isa. xxii. 22, 23, 24.* Not only adult Believers (compar'd to Flagons) but also the Offspring and Issue (tho' Vessels of small quantity, like Cups) are Vessels in the House of God, that they shall hang upon Christ. He

He owns *this is spoken in the Letter of Eliakim, and his Father's House*; and that it hath any respect to Christ, the Text cited by him does not prove. But, if it be admitted that 'tis meant of Christ, as typified by *Eliakim*, the Cause of Infants Baptism will receive no Support from this place. For, as the Kindred and Family of *Eliakim*, both great and small, receiv'd Lustre and Advantage from their Relation to him; so all that are united to Christ, of what Age or Degree soever, receive much more from him. But that the Seed of Believers are so related to Christ, this Scripture doth not acquaint us.

VI. *Infants as well as others were baptiz'd to Moses, the Type of Christ, in the Cloud, and in the Sea; therefore in the Antitype, Infants, as well as others, must be baptiz'd to Christ; for the Antitype may not be strained short of the Type,* 1 Cor. x. 1, 2.

That the Passage of the *Israelites* thro' the Red Sea, where the Waters stood upon each side of them, and the Cloud was over their Heads, whereby they seem'd, as it were, overwhelm'd with Water, was a lively Type of the manner of administering Baptism, as appointed by Christ, and practis'd by the primitive Christians, not only we, but also many Pedobaptists do assert. How our Brethren satisfy themselves with using only Aspersions, or Perfusions, which no more answers to this Figure, than to the Signification of the Word, and the Practice of *John Baptist*, Christ, and his Apostles, and the declar'd Ends of the Ordinance, I know not. But 'tis likewise said, *Verse 3, 4. that they did all eat the same spiritual Meat, and did all drink the same spiritual Drink*; and if that don't warrant the bringing Infants to the Lord's Supper, the other as little shews their Right to Baptism.

C H A P. IX.

An Answer to Mr. H's Ninth Chapter.

MR. H. begins his IX. Chapter with this *Objection*: *Under the New Testament they profess'd their Faith before they were receiv'd into the Church, or baptiz'd.* To which he answers; *So they did under the Old*

and instances in the *Profelytes*, whose Seed were circumcis'd with their Parents.

'Tis well known there was as exprels a Command for circumcising the Children of *Profelytes*, as that they themselves should be circumcis'd. Whence we may see, that when 'twas God's Will any Ordinance should be administer'd to Children, as well as to Parents, he gave plain Directions to do it, and no doubt would have done the like in this Case, if he had design'd the Children of Believers should have been baptiz'd, as well as their Parents. A Command to circumcise Children, is no Command to baptize them; and the Circumcision of Children, in Obedience to a Divine Command, doth rather condemn, than justify the baptizing them without one.

But he adds; *To say, that because those who profess'd Faith were baptiz'd, therefore their Children were not baptiz'd, is both proofless, and ridiculous, notwithstanding they insist so much thereon.* He would do well to tell us what Antipedobaptists insist on this; for my own part, I don't know of any that do. From the want indeed either of a Command requiring it, or an Example that it ever was practised by *John*, or the Apostles of our Saviour, they conclude 'tis not our Lord's Will Infants should be baptiz'd. And therefore the *Objection* should rather have been stated thus: All who were baptiz'd in the primitive times, confess'd their Sins, and profess'd their Faith; which Infants are not capable of doing, and consequently were not then baptiz'd. And 'till he is able to produce an Instance, that any one in those times was admitted to Baptism, but upon Repentance, and a Profession of Faith, this Argument will keep its Force.

He proceeds to put this *Question*; *Whether any Persons who have been once solemnly baptiz'd in, or into the Name of the most sacred Trinity, in their Infancy, ought to be baptiz'd again when grown up, and profess their Faith?*

To this I answer; Where any Person hath been once duly baptiz'd, he ought not to be baptiz'd again. But when only something is done under that Name, without the thing, to one for whom Christ never requir'd Baptism should be administer'd, it is (as I take it) a Nullity, and don't in the least free the Person from an Obligation to submit to that Ordinance, when he becomes a proper Subject of it. And I am not able to discern in that large
Col-

Collection of Scriptures produc'd by Mr. H. any Direction for sprinkling of Water in the Name of the sacred Trinity, upon Infants.

What he says next of *Baptism's being the Seal of the Covenant*, and that *Covenant-interest*, and not a *Profession of Faith*, is a sufficient Ground of applying *Baptism*, has been disprov'd already in the *Introduction*; as likewise what follows, where he tells us, that the *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*, have sufficiently declar'd from *Heaven* the *Interest of the Children of the Godly in the Covenant*, and its *Privileges*; if by the *Covenant* he mean the *New Covenant*, and by the *Children of the Godly*, all *Children*, one or both of whose *Parents* are *Believers*.

But what comes next should be something extraordinary, by his calling upon us particularly to observe it; Here observe, says he, the *Policy* (not to say *Cowardice*) of those who fight against the *Children of Believers*, and their *Baptism*. (1.) They endeavour with all their *Might* to make these *Children* stand by themselves in a single *Capacity*, that they may the more easily beat, and overcome them. (2.) Having thus done, they divide their own *Party* into two *Bands*, agreeing hardly in any thing, save to fight with, and oppose the poor *Infants* in their *Rights and Privileges*, who, alas! never thought them any harm. The two *Bands* dignify and distinguish themselves with the *Names or Titles of general and particular Baptists*; and will have it either by *Hook or by Crook*.

For my part, I can see nothing observable here, but a further Instance of his *Uncharitableness*. We don't desire to fight against, but for our own, and our *Brethren's Children*, against such dangerous *Notions* as he at every turn endeavours to instil into them; and the *Conquest* we wish for is, to bring them to see their need of *Christ*, to believe in him, and submit themselves unto him; and as they never did us any *Harm*, we are willing to do them the greatest *Good* we can. And tho' according to his usual *Positiveness*, he ventures to say the *Antipedobaptists distinguish themselves by the Names or Titles of general and particular Baptists*; yet I much question whether he is able to prove who it was that first so distinguish'd them; whether they themselves, or those who oppose them; or, whether they were given to dignify, or (as the *Title of Nazarens* to the primitive *Christians*) to reproach them; or, whether they did not arise, without any such *Design*, merely

merely from their different Apprehensions as to the Object and Extent of Redemption, wherein Pedobaptists no less disagree among themselves. And one would have thought, a Person of so *clear an Head* might easily have discern'd that these things were capable of being, with no less Force, retorted on his own Opinion ; and that an Antipedobaptist might with as much Reason say ; *Here observe the Policy (not to say the Cowardice) of those who fight against the Faith and Practice of the Antipedobaptists.* (1.) *They endeavour with all their Might to make them stand by themselves, as if they were herein contrary, not only to Protestant Churches in general, but also to the Scriptures, and Practice of the Apostles, (p. 115, 123.) that they may the more easily beat, and overcome them ;* whereas on the contrary, the Holy Scriptures, and the first Ages after Christ, as well as many eminent Writers since, do justify both their Faith and Practice in this Point. (2.) *Having thus made them (as they conceit) to stand by themselves, they divide their own Party, not only into two, but many Bands, as contrary one to another, as they all are in this Point contrary to the Truth ; agreeing, tho' not in many other things, yet to fight with, and oppose the poor contemptible Antipedobaptists, (as he represents us, p. 116.) who, alas ! never thought them any harm. These Bands are Dignify'd and Distinguish'd with various Names and Titles, as Papists, Prelatists, Presbyterians, Independants, &c. And some of most, if not of all these, are for general, others for particular Redemption, and will have it either by Hook or by Crook. These things, I say, might with as much Justice be return'd by an Antipedobaptist, as they are urged upon them by Mr. H. Tho' I must confess they become neither, a more charitable Treatment of each other better suiting the Religion we profess.*

But he proceeds to acquaint us with the different Principles, upon which *general* and *particular Baptists* deny Infant-baptism. *The general Baptists* (says he) *affirm Infants have no Sin, and therefore they must not be baptiz'd.* This is not a just Account of the Sentiments of many, if not the most, of those who are usually call'd by that Name ; not a few of them owning the Doctrine of original Sin. And one would think Mr. H. might speak as favourably of those who oppose it, as another, since he tells us, the infants of believing Parents, as such, are purer than the most sancti-

sanctify'd adult Believers in the Church Militant. See p. 97. But 'tis not this for which any of them chiefly object against that Practice, but the want of Divine Authority to warrant it. And I might tell him, that one half, at least, of those that plead for Pedobaptism, urge this as one great Reason for their Practice, that 'tis necessary to wash away Original Sin, tho' many others reject that Notion.

As for the particular Baptists, they say (as he tells us) *Infants have no Grace, and therefore they must not be baptiz'd.* But this is also as unfair a Representation of them. For they don't say that God hath not wrought Grace in the Soul of any Infant, but that 'tis evident he hath not done it in all descending from godly Parents; and they know not which of them in particular is made a Partaker of it; and that God not having given Direction to baptize any but such who make a satisfactory Profession of Faith, which Infants are incapable of, they dare not presume to do it in his Name, without his Command. But let us hear what Answer he makes to both.

To the general Baptists I say, If your Infants have no Sin, they are much better than their Parents, who have Sin enough. But if they have no Sin, why do you reject them from Church-membership? Will ye reject the pure in Heart, and receive the impure. To this, I think, they may very well reply; If you look upon all the Infants of Believers to be *pure in Heart*, and that all such have a *Right to Church-membership*, why do you exclude them from the Lord's Supper? Will you shut out the *pure in Heart* from that holy Ordinance, and receive those which you say are *less pure*, to it?

In his Answer to the particular Baptists, he endeavours to perswade us, that *the Seed and Offspring of Believers have the Holy Ghost*, Isa. xlv. 3. *that they are sanctified, have the Seeds or Habits of Grace, and that they are Partakers of the inward Grace of Regeneration, and ought therefore to partake of the outward Sign of it.* As to Isa. xlv. 3. 'twill be afterwards explain'd in this Chapter. And if he mean not that all the Offspring of every Believer partakes of these Blessings, he says nothing; and if that be his Meaning, it must unavoidably follow, that new-born Souls may be again unborn, and the Principles of Grace once implanted, may be lost; altho' our Saviour tells us otherwise, *John iv. 13, 14. Jesus answered, and said unto her, Whosoever drinketh of this Water, shall thirst again: But who-*
ever

ever drinketh of the Water that I shall give him, shall never thirst; but the Water that I shall give him, shall be in him a Well of Water, springing up into everlasting Life. So 1 John iii. 9. Whosoever is born of God, doth not commit Sin; for his Seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.

He proceeds to bring in his mistaken Brethren, as calling on him to shew them the Words of Institution for the Ordinance of Infant-baptism, &c. And for Answer, he intreats them to shew him the Words of Institution for Womens and Mens Baptism; and says, those Words in Matth. xxviii. 19. were not the Institution of that Ordinance, for it was instituted long before.

His denying Matth. xxviii. 19. to be the Institution of Baptism, because 'twas instituted before, is but trifling with the Word; the Institution, or Appointment of a thing, not necessarily implying 'twas not in Use before. Thus 2 Chron. xxiii. 18. we read, that Jehoiada appointed the Offices of the House of the Lord, by the hand of the Priests, the Levites, whom David had distributed in the House of the Lord. But if Matth. xxviii 19. be not the Institution of Baptism, 'tis the great Commission whence all Gospel Ministers have their Authority and Direction for the Practice of this Ordinance, in all Ages of the Church. Doth Christ here, or any where else, command his Ministers to baptize Infants? And by comparing that place with Mark. xvi. 16. we shall find, Christ expressly commandeth the baptizing of all such who are made Disciples by teaching, and believe, whether Men or Women. Make Disciples all Nations, baptizing them. And, preach the Gospel to every Creature, he that believeth, and is baptiz'd, &c. Which we are expressly inform'd that the first Ministers expounded by their Practice, to relate to Believers of both Sexes, Acts viii. 12. & xvi. 15. Shew us but such Authority for Infants Baptism, and we shall judge it our Duty to practise it. But to send us to Gen. xvii. where they are required to be circumcis'd, is never likely to satisfy us.

But he tells us, *If Children are not named in the Words of Institution, if such were to be found, it would not thence follow, that they were not to be baptiz'd; any more than it follows, that Women are not to partake of the Lord's Supper, because they are not nam'd in the Words of Institution of that Sacrament.*

148 *An Answer to Mr. H's Ninth Chapter.*

These two Cases, which he would represent as parallel, will be found very different to any considerate Person. For, (1.) The Qualifications necessary to the Lord's Supper are to be found in Women, as well as Men; such as Faith to discern the Lord's Body, and to do it in remembrance of Christ, Ability to examine themselves, &c. And if he be able to prove that Infants may be *made Disciples by teaching*, and thereby be brought to believe, and profess their Faith, I will no longer contend with him. (2.) As it is expressly declar'd, that Women were baptiz'd, *Acts viii. 12. xvi. 15.* so we are informed, that all the 3000 Souls (which Term denotes Women as much as Men) who were converted, and baptiz'd, *Acts ii. continued steadfastly in the Apostle's Doctrine, and Fellowship, and breaking of Bread.* Whence the Scriptures plainly furnish us with this Argument: All that were baptiz'd, were admitted to the Lord's Supper: Believing Women were baptiz'd, as well as Men, and consequently admitted with them to the Lord's Supper. And if the following Argument was as unexceptionable: All who have an Interest in the Covenant of Grace, have a Right to Baptism: All the Children of Believers have an Interest in the Covenant of Grace, and therefore a Right to Baptism: If this Argument, I say, were as true as the former, 'twould sufficiently satisfy us as to the Practice of Pedobaptism. But as 'tis not, I can't but continue of the Mind, that *the Infant's Way to Baptism is not made so clear and plain as the Woman's Way to the Lord's Table*, whatsoever Mr. H. affirms to the contrary.

As to what follows, Whether *Infants Baptism be a distinct Ordinance from the Baptism of the Adult*; or applying the Lord's own Ordinance of Baptism to a wrong Subject; be it which it will (and one of them it must be) they are both unwarrantable. Nor do I see but the latter is as much an Intrusion upon the Authority of the Lawgiver, as the former. A Subject may as well undertake to make a Law, as to disannul, or alter one made by Supreme Authority.

In the next place we are presented with 21 Heads from Scripture, each of which, he says, p. 98. affords sufficient Argument for the baptizing of Infants. I shall briefly consider them in the Order they stand.

I. *Revealed things belong to them as well as to their Parents*, Deut. xxix. 29.

I answer, (1.) *Revealed things* can't belong to them who are incapable to understand them, which Infants, of whose Right to Baptism he now speaks, are ; any otherwise than to direct their Parents how to act towards them, or to afford them ground of Hope concerning them ; for which they are to seek Information from other Places of Scripture, this affording none, and therefore is very far from being a sufficient Argument to baptize them. (2.) The Lord's Supper is a *revealed thing*, as well as Baptism ; and if this Text affords sufficient Argument for one, it must also for the other. (3.) This Passage speaks not of the Infant Seed of Believers, as such, but of their Posterity, to whom the Revelation of God's Will cometh, as contained in his Word ; which no less forbids a curious Enquiry into, and groundless Assertions about unrevealed things (of which Infant, Baptism is one) than it requires a Belief of whatsoever God hath revealed, and the Performance of every thing he hath commanded.

II. *As touching the Election, they are beloved for the Fathers sakes*, Rom. xi. 28. Deut. vii. 6, 7. iv. 31, 37.

Are the Infants of Believers, as such, the Election ? Are they all chosen of God, effectually called, and eternally saved, as the Design of the Apostle is to prove concerning those of whom he speaks in Rom. xi. 28 ? And are they, as Elect, to be admitted to Baptism ; and none of the Children of Unbelievers chosen of God, and thereby intituled to that Ordinance ? Deut. vii. and iv. speak of the natural Posterity of Abraham by Isaac, and their being chosen of God, by a free and gracious Act of his Will, to be a peculiar People to himself in that Covenant first transacted with Abraham, and afterwards compleated at Mount Sinai, by appointing all Ordinances suited to it, which were made the intire Rule of the Church's Obedience till the time of Reformation ; which was a lively Type of his chusing his People in Christ unto Faith, Holiness, and Eternal Life. As no foreseen Excellency or Worthiness moved him to the Choice of the former, to the Participation of those peculiar Privileges ; so neither of the latter to Blessings of a higher Nature.

III. *They are said to be a godly Seed*, Mal. ii. 15.

Many of the Jews at that time had taken Wives of the idolatrous Nations, to the grief and prejudice of their first and lawful Wives of the Jewish Race ; for which the Lord,

by the Prophet, sharply reproveth and threatens them, in this Chapter; and among other Arguments, to convince them of their great Sin in so doing, shews (as I take it) that Polygamy, however tolerated for a Season, was never warrantable, from God's creating but one Woman for the first Man, when he could, had it been his Pleasure, have created more; which might also have seemed more necessary for peopling the World at first. And he subjoins the Reason why one only was created, (thereby directing Men to have but one Wife at a time) because he sought a *godly Seed*, or, as the Original expresseth it, a *Seed of God*, i. e. an excellent Seed, born in chaste Wedlock, the Issue of a lawful Marriage. And if a *gracious* or *holy Seed*, and not a *legitimate Seed* only, be intended, God might be said to seek it, in appointing, by this Example, the most likely Means to produce it; for in Polygamy such Inconveniences generally arose, that greatly obstructed the good Examples and Instructions which were needful to promote it. But here is not a Word of any federal Holiness derived from the Faith of the Parents, but only such as the Marriage of one Man with one Woman was best suited to produce. And 'tis well known that such an Holiness, or Covenant-interest, as gave a Right to Circumcision, adher'd to the Issue of those Jews who had many Wives, as well as to the Offspring of those who had but one at a time. And the Prophet has no respect here to any Qualification to Ordinances, but what Mr. H. acknowledges to relate as well to those who lived before the Appointment of any *outward Seal*, as to such who lived after it. From all which it is plain enough, that this Text affords no sufficient Argument for Infants Baptism.

IV. *They are called the Lord's chosen ones*, 1 Chron. xvi. 13. Isa. xlv. 1, 2, 3, 4. Deut. iv. 37. & x. 15. Rom. xi. 28. Psal. cv. 42, 43. with Exod. x. 9.

The Answer to his II. *Head* is sufficient to satisfy any impartial Enquirer, that this affords him no Assistance. For all the Texts here cited by him (except Rom. xi. 28. which hath been explained before, and Isa. xlv. which speaks of the spiritual Seed, whereof the carnal were Types) treat of God's chusing the natural Seed of Abraham to be a peculiar People, separate from other Nations, for the bringing forth of the *Messiah*; on whom many special Privileges were conferred, to direct their Faith to him. And that the Off-

Offspring of Believers now are chosen of God for the same End, none will imagine.

V. *They are such whose Hearts the Lord doth circumcise ; for he hath promised to be a God to, and circumcise the Hearts of his People, and their Seed, Gen. xvii. 7, 10. with Deut. xxx. 6.*

If God hath absolutely promised to circumcise the Hearts of all the Offspring of his People, his Faithfulness is engaged to effect it ; *Hath he said it, and shall he not do it ?* That *Gen. xvii. 7, 10.* speaks of the Circumcision in the Flesh, and not of the Heart, is evident. And as to *Deut. xxx. 6.* the Judicious Mr. Poole tells us, " This Promise " principally respects the Times of the Gospel, and the " Grace which was to be then imparted to all God's *Israel* " (*i. e.* all his Chosen ones) by Christ, by whom alone " this Circumcision is obtained, *Col. ii. 11.* And its not being fulfilled to all the Nation of the *Jews*, who partook of the Circumcision of the Flesh, plainly shews, that 'twas not made to them as the natural Seed of *Abraham*.

VI. *They are the Lord's Blessed ones, Psal. xxxvii. 26. & cxii. 2. & cxv. 12, 13, 14, 15. & cxlvii. 13. Prov. xx. 7. Isa. lxiv. 3. & lxi. 9. & lxv. 23. Mark x. 16.*

That God did bestow many signal Favours on the Offspring of his People, as a Fruit and Token of his Love to their Parents, and still does so, I shall not deny. Nay, their being the Children of such, if God continue their Parents with them, is a great Blessing, they having the advantage of their good Instruction and Example. But what Argument this affords for Infants Baptism, I know not ; unless it could be prov'd they are not only all blessed with the Grace of Faith, but also with an Ability to make Profession of it.

VII. *They are the Lord's Heritage, Psal. cxxvii. 3. Joel ii. 16, 17.*

Psal. cxxvii. 3. tells us, *Children are an Heritage of the Lord, i. e.* a Portion given by the Lord. And *Joel ii. 16, 17.* directs the *Jews* to bring the little Children that suck'd the Breasts to a solemn Fast, which the Prophet directs them to sanctify, they being in danger to be involv'd with their Parents in the same public Calamity, which they were thus solemnly to beg that God would avert. And this might be partly to excite the grown Persons to more earnest Supplications to God for Mercy ; and partly to move the Lord to

152 *An Answer to Mr. H's Ninth Chapter.*

shew Mercy, as he did to *Nineveh*, for the sake of those little ones, who *knew not their Right Hand from their Left*. And in their Supplications they were to beg, that God would not give *his Heritage to Reproach*; for, such he had owned the Body of the *Israelitish Nation*. But those little ones were not in general the Children of Believers, of whom he pretends to speak; and if they had, what this would be to his purpose, I can't apprehend.

VIII. *The Lord challengeth them as his own, as born to him, as his from the Womb, &c.* Ezek. xvi. 20, 21. Isa. xlv. 2, 3, 21, 24. & xlv. 3, 4. Psal. lxxi. 6.

All the Nation of the *Jews* were in Covenant with God, in the Sense already explained; he might therefore claim a Propriety in them. Those mentioned Ezek. xvi. 20, 21. whose Children the Lord claims as his, were abominable and cruel *Idolaters*, as the Prophet there declares. Will this prove then, that the Faith of Parents, and their Interest in the Covenant of Grace, conveys an Interest in the same Covenant, and a Right to Baptism, to their Seed? In Isa. xlv. & xlv. the Lord puts that People in mind, that it was his Act first to take them to be *his People*, and what he had done for them ever since. In Ver. 3. of Chap. xlv. he makes a gracious Promise to the true spiritual Seed, of *pouring his Spirit upon them*. What David saith of himself, Psal. lxxi. 6. is true of all Men, but in a special manner of Believers, that *the Lord hath holden them up from the Womb, &c.* But what is this to the baptizing of Infants?

IX. *God is their God, a God to them, and they are in Covenant with him*, Gen. xvii. 7, &c. Deut. xxix. 10, 11, 12, 13. Acts ii. 39. Psal. xxii. 10. and the *Angels have Charge over them*, Matt. xviii. 2, 10. Heb. i. 14.

The three first of these Places have been particularly spoke to before; and what use he can make of the last I can't understand. Psal. xxii. 10. is meant of Christ himself. In Matt. xviii. Interpreters generally own that our Lord speaks of such as are like to little Children in Humility. So Calvin on Ver. 5. *Jam metaphorice pueros appellat Christus, qui, deposita altitudine, se ad modestiam & subjectionem composuerint: i. e. Christ here metaphorically calls those Children, who having laid aside Pride, become modest and humble.* And Pool's Annotations on Ver. 6. "Whoso receiveth such a little Child, that is, an humble Christian. In the next Verse it is "opened by one that believeth on me."

X. *They are related to Christ, the good Shepherd, as Lambs of his Flock, and Fold; and of them he is most tender, gathering them with his Arm, and carrying them in his Bosom,* Isa. xl. 11. *with Mark xvi. 16. Ezek. xxxvii. 24, 25.*

We have only Mr. H's bare Word to evince the Truth of this Assertion. Scriptures indeed are here cited by him after his usual manner, but none of them give us the least Hint that the Infants of Believers, as such, are there intended, or stand related to Christ *as Lambs of his Flock*. Our Lord himself compar'd the Seventy to *Lambs*, Luke x. 3. whom he sent out to preach the Gospel, and commands Peter, John xxi. 15. *to feed his Lambs*; and must these be all Infants? We know that among Believers, some are arriv'd to greater Strength of Grace, whilst new Converts, or others of little Knowledge and Strength, may fitly be compar'd to *Lambs*, and eminently need such tender Care, as the Lord, by the Prophet, Isa. xl. 11. assures us the chief Shepherd will take of them. And certainly there is more Reason to conclude, these Words were written for the Comfort of such, who are liable to many Fears and Discouragements under a Sight of their own Weakness; than for the sake of those who are incapable to understand such gracious Promises, and to derive any Support from them. And if all Believers Children stand related to Christ *as Lambs of his Flock*, how comes it to pass that some of them are lost, and perish eternally? Is it for want of the great Shepherd's Care, Skill, or Power? Hath he less Care of the *Lambs*, for whom in a particular manner he expresseth such tender Regard, than of the *Sheep*, whom he will preserve, and safely keep to the End? John x. 27, 28, 29. *My Sheep hear my Voice.--- And I give unto them eternal Life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any Man pluck them out of my Hand. My Father which gave them me, is greater than all, and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's Hand.* But whatever Mr. H. says, all Christ's Flock are intended here by his *Sheep*, and shall, as a glorious Fruit of his Love and Faithfulness, be preserv'd from eternal Perdition; which is not perform'd towards Believers Children in general.

XI. *The Holy Scripture doth comprehend Children, together with their Parents, in that most common Phrase, The Lord's People, or People of God, Exod. viii. 1, 20. with Chap. x. 9. & xii. 31, 37. Psal. cv. 42, 43. Joel ii. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 27. Deut. xxix. 11, 13.* The

154 *An Answer to Mr. H's Ninth Chapter.*

The whole Body of the *Israelitish* Nation was so call'd, wherein were many adult Unbelievers, as well as Children; yea, the greater Number of them were destitute of saving Faith, *Isa.* x. 22, 23. compar'd with *Rom.* ix. 27. Wherefore this would as much prove the Right of adult Unbelievers to Baptism, as that of Believers Children.

XII. *Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*, *Mark* x. 14, 15. *Ezek.* xxxvii. 25. This hath been answer'd before in *Chap.* VI.

XIII. *Little Children that suck the Breasts are Members of Zion, and part of the Congregation and Assembly that are by God's Command gather'd together, and sanctify'd*, *Joel* iii. 15, 16. This hath likewise been spoke to already under his VII. Head.

XIV. *They are the Lord's Servants*, *Lev.* xxv. 41, 42. 34, 35. with *Psal.* cxvi. 16.

If barely the Appellation of the *Lord's Servants* would prove their Right to Baptism, then such an Heathen as *Nebuchadnezzar*, who is call'd *the Lord's Servant*, *Jer.* xxv. 9. xxvii. 6. & lxiii. 10. might also have such a Right. But the Children of the unbelieving, as well as believing Jews might be call'd *the Lord's Servants*, on account of that Covenant of Peculiarity, which is now abolish'd; tho' even before Christ's Death this gave them no Right to Baptism, *Matth.* iii. 8, 9.

XV. *They are such that have the Spirit of God*, *Isa.* xlv. 2, 3. lix. 21.

Neither of the *Texts* cited assert any such thing; it must either be the carnal Seed of *Abraham*, the Jews in general, or the spiritual Seed, to whom the Promise is made *Isa.* xlv. 3. the former it cannot be, many of them being sensual, not having the Spirit, as the Apostle's Phrase is *Jude*, verse 19. and therefore it must be the latter. And let it be prov'd, that the carnal Seed of Believers are *Abraham's* spiritual Seed. *Isa.* lix. 21. contains a Promise made of the Father to Christ, touching the Seed given of the Father to him. And 'tis plain from *Rom.* viii. 8, 9. that none, in whom the Spirit of God dwelleth, are in an unregenerate State: So then, they that are in the *Flesh* cannot please God; but ye are not in the *Flesh*, but in the Spirit, if ye be that the Spirit of God dwell in you.

XVI. They are such whom the *Lord* teacheth, *Isa.* liv. 13. *Jer.* xxxi. 34. *Hieb.* viii. 11.

It must be own'd, that in all these New Covenant Promises the Faithful God hath declar'd he will so *teach* all them, to whom they are made, that they shall certainly arrive at the *saving Knowledge of him*, but all the Children of Believers are not so *taught*. Neither do any of the *Texts* cited speak one word of the Infants of Believers, as such. *Isa.* liv. 13. speaks of such as the Church and her Ministry should be instrumental to *beget by the Gospel*, as the Apostle expresses it, *1 Cor.* iv. 15. *Philem.* ver. 10. who are therefore call'd the Church's Children.

XVII. *They are the Disciples of Christ, Acts* xv. 1, 10. *with Acts* xxi. 20, 21.

Those to whom our Lord in his great Commission requireth Baptism to be administer'd, are to be made *Disciples* by the Ministry of Men. The Direction is, *Matth.* xxviii. 19. *μαθητεύσατε, Make Disciples by teaching*, of which Infants are not capable. Nor does it appear from the Passages produc'd by Mr. H. that Infants are there call'd *Disciples*. In *Acts* xv. 1. 'tis said, that *some which came down from Judea taught the Brethren, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved*. With reference to which *Peter, verse* 10. says, *Why tempt ye God, to put a Yoke upon the Neck of the Disciples, &c?* And *Acts* xxi. 21. we are told, that the Church at Jerusalem were inform'd that *Paul taught the Jews which were among the Gentiles, that they ought not to circumcise their Children*. These Places put together prove, that some Jewish Teachers would have perswaded the Gentile Converts to be circumcised themselves, and to circumcise their Children; which *Peter* calls imposing a Yoke upon the Neck of the Disciples. But doth it hence follow, that they would have none circumcis'd but Disciples? Or, that all were Disciples on whom they would have impos'd Circumcision? Nothing less. Their obliging the Parents to circumcise their Children, may as well be call'd *laying a Yoke on their Necks*, as directing them to submit to it themselves. It is grievous to a tender Parent to be oblig'd to cause that to be done to his Child, which is not only painful and unprofitable, but also very prejudicial; as the Apostle declares Circumcision to have been, to them who submitted to it as necessary to Salvation, *Gal.* v. 3. *I testify again to every Man that is circumcised, that he is a Debtor to do the whole Law*. It may not be amiss also to consider, if the Jewish Christians were so zealous to have

156 *An Answer to Mr. H's Ninth Chapter.*

have their Children circumcised, as it appears they were *Acts* xxi. 21. whether it be likely they understood what our Brethren contend so earnestly for, as a main Pillar of Infant-baptism, viz. That Baptism cometh in the room of Circumcision, and belongs to the same Subjects, as a Seal to them of the same Covenant that Circumcision had been. For it seems very probable they would have been willing to change Circumcision, a painful, for Baptism, a more easy Ordinance, if they had been taught that their Children had a Right to the latter then, as to the former under the Law; and that one was appointed by the Lord Jesus to succeed the other, for the same Use and Ends.

XVIII. *They are Holy*, 1 *Cor.* vii. 14. and called Saints, and are Church-members. *Eph.* i. 1. with vi. 1, 4. *Col.* i. 2. with iii. 20. *Deut.* xxxiii. 1, 3. These things have all been answer'd before.

XIX. *They are said to hope*, *Psal.* xxii. 9, 10. & lxxi. 5, 6. and to believe in Christ, *Matth.* xviii. 25, [which I suppose is misprinted for 2, 5,] 6.

The Words to which he has reference in *Psal.* xxii. 9. are, *Thou didst make me to hope when I was upon my Mother's Breasts.* That is, says Mr. Poole, "Thou didst give me sufficient Ground for *Hope* and *Trust*, if I had then been capable of acting that Grace, because of thy wonderful and watchful Care over me in that weak and helpless State; which was eminently true of Christ, whom God so miraculously preserv'd, and provided for in his Infancy; the History whereof we read, *Matth.* ii. It is not strange that *Hope* is figuratively ascribed to Infants, seeing even the brute Creatures are said to *hope*, *Rom.* viii. 20. and to *wait*, and to *cry to God*, *Psal.* cxlv. 15. & cxlvii. 9." This learned Man, we see, did not look upon Children to be capable of acting the Grace of *Hope*, and says *Hope* is only figuratively ascrib'd to them. And Mr. H. will find it a difficult Task, to prove that such have a Right to Baptism, to whom *Hope* is only figuratively ascrib'd, meerly on that account. *Psal.* lxxi. 5. saith, that the Lord was David's *Trust* from his Youth: And that in Youth Persons may profess *Faith* and *Hope*, on which Baptism ought to be administer'd, I readily grant. In *Matth.* xviii. our Lord says not that Infants believe. In *Verse* 2. we are told, he called to him *τῷ παιδί*, a Boy, or Lad, who seems to have been of Age and Strength sufficient to understand the

the Call of Christ, and to come to him upon it, as was estimated before from *Grotius*, in *Chap. VI. p. 96*. And so Mr. *Leigh* explains it, *Puer qui ambulare potest, A Boy able to walk*. The same Word also is us'd to express a *Damsel* of twelve Years old, *Mark v. 39, 40*. In *Verse 3*. our Lord solemnly assureth them, that *except they were converted, and became as little Children*, (not in all respects, but in Humility, &c.) *they could not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*. And in *Verse 4*. he shews the great Happiness to which such one shall be advanc'd, who, in the Sense before explain'd, is like a little Child; and of such an one, he saith, *Verse 5*. *Who so receiveth him in my Name, receiveth me*; and in *Verse 6*. shews the great Danger of offending one of those little ones, of whom he had last spoken; and that none might mistake whom he intended, he tells them they were such that believ'd in him. And that actual Believers, capable to make a Profession of Faith, whom the Grace of God hath made humble and lowly, are here meant by our Saviour, *Expositors* generally own; tho' Mr. *H.* to serve his own *Hypothesis*, would perswade us 'tis to be understood of Infants, such who are descended from believing Parents, and that they also are Believers, when the *Evangelist* intimates no such thing. Nay, the greatest part of *Pedobaptists* have always acknowledg'd that such Infants, of whom we speak, are incapable of Faith. A late learned *Author*, in his *History of Baptism, Part 1. p. 145*. tells us, that *St. Austin* (who liv'd in the latter end of the 4th Century, and was one of the most strenuous Contenders for Infants Baptism) "did not think, nor pretend that Infants that are baptiz'd, have in any proper Sense Faith, or Repentance, or Conversion of the Heart, &c. How much soever he is here press'd with the Difficulty of explaining the Reasons, why the *Godfather* answers in the Child's Name, *He does believe*; he does not for all that, fly to the justifying so great a *Paradox*, as to say, that the Child does indeed in a proper Sense understand, believe, or disbelieve any thing. And a little after he grants, That Infants cannot as yet believe with the Heart, or confess with the Mouth. And *p. 147*. he says, *St. Austin* observes they are often in a Fit of Crying and Fretfulness all the while, which, as he remarks, would be very sinful, if they had any Understanding." From whence it appears that Faith was then judg'd necessary for

for Infants, as well as adult Persons in order to Baptism, which the former were accounted incapable. And therefore when that Practice first began to be generally admitted, Sureties were made use of, who answer'd in the Name of the Child, that *it did believe*; which they who now pretend to baptize Infants, and reject the Use of Sureties because uncommanded, would do well to consider, since it seems to overthrow all their Plea from Antiquity for that Practice. And the *National Church* do in their *Catechism* expressly declare, both that *Faith and Repentance are required of those that are to be baptiz'd, and that Infants are incapable thereof*. The reason therefore which they allege for baptizing them is, that *they perform them both by their Sureties*. But if the Faith of the Sureties, as they, or the Parents, as others plead, be imputed to them; one would think their Baptism might with no less Reason be imputed to them likewise, and their being actually baptiz'd no way needful.

XX. *They are to be brought to Christ in his Church* Isa. xlix. 22. *And our Lord hath commanded his Ministers and Churches not to forbid, but suffer them to come* Matth. xix. 25. with Chap. xxviii. 20. and hath said *he will save them*, Isa. xlix. 25. Matth. xviii. 2, 10, 14.

Not one of these Places speaks of the Offspring of Believers, as such, much less do they require the bringing such to Christ in his Church, as he vainly asserts. But these Scriptures have been already consider'd, and therefore I shall not insist on them again here.

XXI. *Whatever some think, or say of them now, yet the time is coming on apace, when all that see them shall, tho' never so loath, acknowledge them that they are the Seed which the Lord hath blessed*, Isa. lxi. 8, 9. & lxv. 23. *This is spoken of the Offspring, the Buds, i. e. Infants; and this their Covenant-right and Blessedness is made visible in a Church-man by some outward Act, owning them to be the Lord's blessed ones; else how shall all come to know, see, and acknowledge them, &c.*

We have here a further Instance of Mr. H's Character for the Antipedobaptists, in his insinuating they would be so loath to own their Children to be blessed of God, when it shall appear that they are so. For, it would be no small Comfort to them, to see good Demonstration that their Offspring are indeed of the number of the Seed that the Lord

hath blessed with the most valuable Blessings. It is what they desire, pray for, and mourn when the contrary appears. And if the Lord had by Promise assured them, that all their Seed should be so blessed by him, 'twould be matter of great Joy to them, as they could not doubt but he would faithfully perform what he had graciously promised. But no satisfactory proof of that, which would be so welcome to them, appears in the *Texts* cited by him, which speak of the spiritual Seed, such for whose Conversion the Ministry in the Church should be blessed, and not of the carnal Seed of Believers, as such. Neither does the Prophet speak of their *Blessedness* being made visible in a Church-day, but by the Splendor of their Graces, and distinguishing Favours bestow'd on them. And when this discovers itself, the Antipedobaptists are very willing to admit them to Baptism and Church-membership. But I now leave it to the Reader's Judgment to determine, whether he had any just Cause to assert, that each of these 21 Heads affords sufficient Argument for Infants Baptism; or whether, considered together in their concurrent Strength, they give room for Peter's Challenge; *Who can forbid Water that these should not be baptiz'd?* For my part, I think there is room enough to challenge him to produce better Arguments for Infant-baptism, than any he has done yet, or else to decline the Controversy.

Page 98. He brings in the Antipedobaptists making this objection; *We can see no express Command in any of the Books of the New Testament, to apply the Token of the Covenant to the Infant-seed of Believers; and we are not to go to the Old Testament for Worship. We read in the New Testament that those who were taught, believ'd, profess'd, &c. were baptiz'd; but shew us the word Infant-baptism if you can.*

Enough having been said of this already, I shall only return a few things in reference to his Answer. And (1.) We may observe, that for want of any Command of Christ or Infants Baptism in the New Testament, he is forc'd to have recourse to *Gen. xvii. & Exod. xii.* where Circumcision is injoin'd the carnal Seed of Abraham, and all their slaves, and every Male that would eat the Passover with them. (2.) His whole Discourse here supposes what is both denied, and hath been fully disprov'd, viz. That Baptism belongs to the same Seed of Abraham that Circumcision formerly did; and that both are Tokens or Seals of one and

and the same Covenant. (3.) The Charge he exhibits against us, that *we greatly sin in continually slighting the Writings of the Old Testament*, is very unjust. To slight any part of Holy Writ is a great Sin, and none ought to be charged with it, for not believing that God design'd the Writings of *Moses*, and the *Prophets*, to inform us who the Subjects are, to whom the Ordinances Christ would give to his Church should be administer'd. The Writings of the Old Testament inform us, that Christ should be a *Prophet like unto Moses*; and we thence conclude, that as *Moses* appointed what Ordinances should be observ'd, and by whom, under the legal Dispensation; so *Christ* was to appoint new Ordinances of Worship, and to whom they should be administer'd, which he hath accordingly done, as he saw best suited to the more spiritual Dispensation of the Gospel. And the Old Testament informing us how plainly the Lord declared his Will at the first Institution of Circumcision, not only as to the Persons, but the exact time to a Day when it should be administer'd, may instruct us that we are to attend to what he is pleased to reveal as to the Subjects of Gospel Ordinances; and that 'tis as unwarrantable for us to appoint either the Subjects, or Time, as the Duties themselves. Nay, when he renew'd his Command for Circumcision in the Wilderness, he repeated the Directions both as to the Subjects and Time, *Lev. xii. 3.* And therefore it can't but seem very strange, that neither *John*, the first Administrator of Baptism, nor our Lord himself, when he gave his Ministers Authority and Direction for the Observation of it for ever afterwards, should give any Order to baptize Infants, nor the least Intimation as to the time when it should be administer'd, otherwise than when their Auditors make a credible Profession of their Faith, had it been our Saviour's Will that Infants should be baptiz'd. And if *Gen. xvii. 10, 12.* be a Command to apply the Token of the Covenant (as Mr. H. would have it) to Infants now 'tis chang'd from Circumcision to Baptism; why is it not as much a Command to keep to the same Day? Then they sin'd, if they either administer'd that Ordinance before the eighth Day, or defer'd it longer, because then they apply'd God's Ordinance to a wrong Subject. Will that Command therefore warrant any to baptize Infants before? Or doth it leave them at Liberty to delay it longer? The Old Testament plainly reveals God's Displea-

sure

sure against those who do any thing in his Worship that he hath not commanded, *Jer. vii. 31. xix. 5. & xxxii. 35.* which all therefore should be careful to avoid. The Lord was angry with King *Uzziah* for presuming to administer an Ordinance without his Direction; *2 Chron. xxvi. 19.* And one would think as much Regard ought to be had to God's Command, in reference to the Persons to whom his Ordinances are administer'd, as to those by whom. And which looks more like *sighting the Writings of the Old Testament*, to do, or not to do, that which cannot be proved to be required of God?

In p. 99. he affirms, *Whatever Alteration the Lord hath made in his Ordinances, and the Subjects thereof, since Christ's coming, from what they were before; it is certain that such Alterations are always for the enlarging the Privileges of the People of God in such Ordinances, but never for the taking away, or lessening any Privilege in any Ordinance that the People of God, as such, did enjoy before Christ's coming.*

Not to insist on the Passover, which has been so often mention'd already; there were many Ordinances given for that typical People to observe, which were Privileges then, to succeed which no others have been since appointed; and yet the Privileges of the Lord's People now both for themselves, and Offspring, when grown to Years of Understanding, are far greater than those of the *Jews* were. And as to Infants, they were really Church-members then; but, as I have said before, no more than nominally so now, even in the Account of many Pedobaptists, so far as appears by their Practice.

We are told, p. 101. that the *Baptism of the Infants of Abraham's Seed, and the Sanctification of the first Day Sabbath being equally and alike commanded of God, must either stand or fall together; and that there is no more expressness of Command to sanctify the first Day Sabbath, than there is to baptize Believers Infants.* To this I answer,

1. There is a great Difference between the Observation of the *Sabbath*, and *Infants Baptism*; because the Observation of a Sabbath is a moral Duty, and therefore inserted among the ten moral Precepts, altho' the Determination of the particular Day of the Seven depends upon Institution; but Baptism is a Duty meerly positive.

2. We have such an Example of the Observation of the first Day, by the Apostle *Paul*, and the Church at *Troas*,

M

for-

for the Celebration of the Duties of the Sabbath, *Acts xx. 6, 7.* as we have not in all the History of the Apostles and primitive Churches, of their observing the Seventh, or any other Day of the Week after the Ascension of our Saviour. We are told there, that the Apostle *Paul*, and his Company, came to *Troas*, where they *abode seven Days*; and upon the first Day of the Week, when the Disciples came together to break Bread, *Paul preach'd to them, &c.* We see it was not the Apostle's coming that Day, or the Day before, that occasion'd their assembling upon that Day rather than any other, for he abode there the space of a Week; so that their assembling then to perform the Duties of the Sabbath, was an act of Choice, and not of Necessity. And it is recorded as the Day upon which the Disciples used to assemble for that Purpose, there being no Intimation of the Apostle's calling them together on some special Occasion on that Day, but rather that they came according to their usual Custom to celebrate those Duties. And no Instance, that I know of, can be produc'd of their assembling as a Church on any other Day but this. For, their preaching in the *Synagogues* on the Seventh, was but to take the Opportunity of the People's being assembled, that they might have some to preach to for their Conversion, for which reason they also sometimes preach'd in the *Markets*. And let but one Example in Scripture be produc'd that the Baptism of Infants was practis'd by any of the Apostles, or any Church in their time, and 'twill satisfy us. I am not now oblig'd to produce the Grounds of our Observation of the *first Day Sabbath*, any further than to shew the Invalidity of his Plea thence taken for *Infant-baptism*. And he must either deny this to be an Example of the Observation of the *first Day*, as a *Sabbath*, or assert that it might be so observ'd by the Apostles, and primitive Christians without a Divine Warrant, or else own that there is not the same Reason for the baptizing of Infants, as for the Sanctification of the *first Day Sabbath*.

His joining the Denial of *Infant-baptism* with that of the *Trinity*, the *Satisfaction of Christ*, and *Original Sin* in the next Page, is no less uncharitable than the Reason he assigns for our so doing is false, viz. *Our not observing what the Holy Scripture teacheth in its harmonious Sense and Meaning.* For, if Infants Baptism could be prov'd by any just Consequence, necessarily deduc'd from Scripture

Pre-

Premises, for my own part I should readily comply with the Practice of it. Tho' I must confess the plain Revelation of God's Will to his People of old, concerning the Subjects of all the Ordinances then appointed by him, makes me think, the Right of Infants to Baptism would not have been left so dark and obscure, had they been designed by him to be the Subjects of it; much less would he have made such Qualifications, which Infants can never be prov'd to partake of, necessary to give a Right to it.

His representing us as *more immodest and unreasonable than the Sadducees*, the worst Sect among the degenerate Jews, and calling our alleging the Reasons of our Dissent from our Pedobaptist Brethren, *Wrangling on to the End*, is not likely to weigh much with any, whose Minds are not leaven'd with the same Rancour and Prejudice, which he seems to be influenc'd by in his whole Discourse. Neither has he any just Reason to expect that we should be so *silenc'd* by his daring Assertions, as the Sadducees by the *unanswerable Arguments of him that spake as never Man spake*.

His comparing us with the *Pharisees*, p. 103. *in wresting the Letter of a few Texts*, as they did the 4th. Commandment, is of the same Complexion with the former invidious Comparison. And I hope, if our Lord had said, as he supposes, *Ye shall baptize no Infants*, we should not have been oppos'd by him, or any other fearing God; and where there is no Adversary, there can be no Victory, much less *Triumph*, which he reflectingly insinuates we should have discovered on that Occasion. But I cannot see, but our Lord's requiring Faith and Repentance of all who are to be baptiz'd, which no Infant can make any Profession of, lays as great a Bar in the way of their Admission, as a *Negative Precept* could have done. There being nothing more in his IX. Chapter that's worth Notice, but what hath been sufficiently answer'd already, I proceed to the X. and last.

C H A P. X.

An Answer to Mr. H's Tenth Chapter.

HAVING examin'd all his Arguments for the Church-membership, and Covenant-interest of Believers Infants, as such, and found them too light to satisfy a serious Enquirer into the Mind of God, concerning the Warrantableness of the Practice he contends for; I shall briefly consider what he alleges in this Chapter, which is, *That this is the Doctrine profess'd, held and practis'd by the Protestant Churches in general.* And there are two things, he says, which make this necessary to be shewn.

1. *Because the Opposers say, that baptizing Infants is Popery.*

Who they are that say this, I know not, and 'tis evident that it both hath been, and still continues to be practis'd by many who disown the *Pope's* Supremacy, and many Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*; tho' not a few of them, in Mr. *H's* Judgment (as I have hinted before) still retain some things, which have no more Foundation in the Word of God, than those they have forsaken. And why should the Authority even of *Protestant Churches* be urged in this matter, by those who take a Liberty to dissent from them in other things, both as ancient and warrantable, so far as appears from any thing which has yet been proved to the contrary. That Infant-baptism was ever practis'd for more than 200 Years after Christ, when a considerable Progress was made in those Deviations from the Purity of the Doctrine and Worship instituted by Christ, which at last issued in that fatal Apostacy under the *Bishop of Rome*, which we call *Popery*, the greatest Searchers into Antiquity have not yet been able to demonstrate. And if * *Hegeſippus* may be allowed to confine the Virgin-purity of the Church to the Days of the Apostles, none have just Reason to be offended with us, if we allow not the Practice of any Churches so long after their Days, to afford sufficient Warrant to vary from the primitive Administration of this Ordinance, as recorded in Scripture.

* *Euseb. H. E. lib. iii. cap. 29.*

2. His other Reason is, *Because in their printed Books against Believers Infants, they fly for Refuge to humane Testimonies.*

The most favourable Construction that can be made of this is, that he has never read, and consider'd what hath been written by those he opposes; who generally declare, when they cite the Testimony of ancient and modern Writers on this Point, they don't do it so much in Confirmation of their Judgment and Practice, as to shew that they have no Reason to decline ingaging their Adversaries at their own Weapon; who being wholly destitute of Precept or Precedent in Scripture, often make a great Flourish with Antiquity, and the Judgment of eminent Men of later times. Tho' in this Contest it has been made appear that the Cause of Pedobaptism is no way advantag'd by it, the most valuable Antiquity speaking nothing for them, and the most eminent Writers among the Moderns letting fall such Expressions, when they speak their Thoughts freely, without respect to this Controversy, as subvert the Foundation of their own Practice. And 'tis always allow'd in Disputation, to urge an Opponent with such Concessions of his own, which enervate the Arguments himself advances. And I hope 'twill not be asserted, that Pedobaptism secures its Patrons from being liable to Self-contradiction, any more than others.

As to his telling us, *We would, he doubts not, be greatly offended, if he should only repeat what some of the same Men have written of us, and our way*; I must needs say, I think he hath shewn himself very willing to offend us greatly, if that will do it. For what is more like to effect it, than for any to say, *We have nothing but Lies for us, and that we do foully Lie*? Which words he hath not scrupled to repeat. And I must tell him, I suppose he would be as greatly offended, if I should transcribe the words of some of the same Men against the Independents.

But he saith; *It's clear, that wanting the Judgment of the great, learned and eminent Servants of Christ on our side, we have chosen to make use of their Names to give Credit to the Cause of Anabaptism.*

It seems Mr. H. hath very contemptible Thoughts of the Antipedobaptists; tho' 'tis no new thing for those who overvalue themselves to undervalue others. But supposing they had been all such unlearned and ignorant Persons, as he represents

166 *An Answer to Mr. H's Tenth Chapter.*

presents them, that would not prove they have not Truth on their side. The *great and learned* among the Jews rejected Christ, when many, whom they despised as ignorant, imbraced him: *John vii. 48. Have any of the Rulers, or of the Pharisees believed on him?* And our Saviour saith, *Matt. xi. 25, 26. I thank thee, O Father, that thou hast hid these things from the Wise and Prudent, and hast revealed them unto Babes: Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight.* And the Apostle, *1 Cor. i. 26. Ye see your calling, Brethren, how that not many wise Men after the Flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called.* The poor Jews, upon their Return from the *Babylonish Captivity*, seem'd very inferior, for Learning and Knowledge, to *David, Solomon*, and other eminent *Kings and Prophets*, who yet resumed the Observation of the Feast of *Tabernacles*, when none from *Joshua's* time till then, had kept that Feast according to the primitive Institution, *Nehem. viii. 14, 15, 16, 17.* And if the Antipedobaptists have been all along so despicable and unlearned as he represents them, their Cause must surely be very good, that their *great and learned* Antagonists have been no better able to shew the Weakness of their Arguments.

When he calls us *the Enemies of Infants*, I suppose he would be thought not to have designed to offend us. And I have proved before, that our Opinion is at least as *charitable* concerning them, as his own.

I shall not detain my self with a particular Examination of the *Testimonies* cited by him; but only desire the Reader to take notice, (1.) That the *Testimonies* of fallible (tho' good) Men will not warrant the Practice of that in the Worship of God, which his Word doth no where injoin. (2.) Many, if not all these *Churches*, differ in Judgment and Practice from Mr. H. in some things relating to Faith and Worship; and he cannot justly expect that their Sentiments should satisfy us in this, when he doth not own them as his Rule in others. (3.) They had no other way to know the Will of God in this matter, than what is now thro' Divine Goodness afforded us, by the Revelation of it in his Word, and the Invalidity of their Pleas from thence hath been already discovered. (4.) Anabaptism (as 'tis call'd) was under a great Reproach, upon account of the Enormities charged on some in *Germany*, who disown'd Infants Baptism; altho' it's too well known that many Pedobaptists

baptists have been guilty of as great: and it proves too hard for some good and wise Men to stem the Tide of vulgar Errors, when they know it cannot be done without exposing themselves to the Censures of many; which may have had a great Influence on them, in retaining that as warrantable, which, had they come unbiass'd to search the Scriptures, would have appeared otherwise. (5.) The giving the Eucharist to Infants appears to have been the general Practice of the Church for several Ages, and as near the Times of the Apostles, which yet is generally now deny'd them. (6.) *Chrism, Exorcism*, the use of *Sponsors, &c.* may lay as early Claim to the Suffrages of great Men, as any can be brought for Infant-baptism; and yet perhaps he may not stick to call some of these at least by the Name of *Popery*. (7.) The *Waldenses*, many of them at least, who are generally own'd by *Protestants* to have been the purest Churches in the darkest Times, denied Infant-baptism, as Mr. *Stennett*, and some others have (as I take it) fully proved. (8.) The Reasons for the Practice of Infant-baptism, alleged by some of the *Authors* Mr. *H.* cites, are not only different, but contradictory, as might easily be made appear. (9.) A late learned Writer before mentioned, in his *History of Baptism*, hath shewn that the holy Martyr Mr. *Philpot* was mistaken in what he affirms of *Auxentius* the Heretic, which invalidates the *Testimony* of that Good Man in this case, as to the first Rise either of Anabaptism, (as he calls it) or Pedobaptism.

The CONCLUSION.

IF Mr. *Hitchin* (or any other) should rejoin to what is written in this *Treatise*, I desire two things. One is, that all *uncharitable* Censures and *Invectives* may be forborn, and that the Matter in Controversy may be debated with that Calmness and Love that becomes Christians. The other thing I desire is, that waving all Digressions, and Matters foreign to the purpose, the chief force of the Arguments advanced against their Practice may be attended to. Particularly let it be proved (if it can be done) that the carnal Seed of Believers, as such, are the spiritual Seed of *Abraham*,

ham, and an Answer given to what is here advanced to the contrary. Let it be shewn likewise, that the Command for Circumcision gives us any more Direction to baptize Infants, than those Precepts which relate to the Passover, to admit them to the Lord's Supper; or else let it be denied, upon good Reasons, that Infants were admitted to the Passover. Moreover I desire it may be made appear from the holy Scriptures, that the same Qualifications were required of the Adult, as prerequisite to Circumcision, which the Gospel requires as necessary to their Baptism: that they bring us good Proof, that the Commission of our Blessed Saviour, and Practice of his Apostles, in the Execution of it, warranteth the Administration of this Ordinance to any, without a *personal* Profession of Faith and Repentance: that they acquaint us how such can be said to have an Interest in that Covenant, wherein the implanting those Graces in the Hearts of all received into it, and the Preservation of them from final Apostacy, is promised by the Lord, to whom these Promises are never fulfill'd: and further, that they shew us how Infants may be accounted Members of the Gospel Church, whom, tho' never before under any Church Censure, they receive into the Church upon Profession of Faith, when grown up to Years of Understanding; or, how they can be added to the Church when adult, if they were born Church Members, and never excommunicated.

4 AP 54

F I N I S.